

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

At last we have in English a worthy *History of Israel* (Milford), on a scale as elaborate as the scholarship behind it is unquestionable. It is in two volumes, each costing fifteen shillings, and running to four hundred and ninety-six and five hundred pages respectively. The first, by Professor T. H. ROBINSON of Cardiff, carries the story from the Exodus to the Fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C.; the other, by Professor W. O. E. OESTERLEY, covers the period from 586 to the Bar-Kokhba Revolt in A.D. 135. The volumes may be purchased separately. Each author, though responsible only for his own volume, has had the benefit of continuous collaboration with the other, so that, despite the diverse authorship, something like a real unity characterizes the presentation of the history. In this issue we shall deal only with the first volume, reserving to the next issue our comment on the second.

Professor ROBINSON comes to his task with ample qualifications. His linguistic accomplishments are not confined to the Semitic languages, and out of his extensive knowledge he is able to speak of Hebrew as 'the most musical tongue ever spoken by human lips.' Here surely it is the voice of the specialist that speaks; we fear that there are other than first year Divinity students who would demur to this description. Anyhow, we can be sure that we are in the hands of one who is thoroughly at home in all the linguistic facts. He has a broad outlook on religion, having already

given us an 'Introduction to the History of Religions.' More particularly he has recently collaborated with Dr. OESTERLEY in a study of Hebrew Religion, while his book on 'Prophecy and the Prophets' shows his competence in dealing with that crucial phase of Hebrew religion. All this was a fitting preparation for a volume on the history of the people whose supreme interest for the modern world is its religion.

Naturally, in this volume he endeavours to exclude this aspect of the subject as far as possible, though to exclude it altogether would be as impossible as it is undesirable. But the task of writing the secular history of Israel is beset by difficulties of many kinds. There is not the smallest doubt in the mind of any scholar that the original documents have been drastically edited. The Elephantine papyri, for example, remind us that gods other than Jahweh were acknowledged by Egyptian Jews as late as the fifth century B.C., and presumably this was also so in pre-exilic Israel to an extent greater than our existing documents would lead us to suspect. Again, on many important events we have the views of only one of the participant parties. What should we really know, for example, of the history, if we had only the Chronicler to guide us?

It is difficult, for example, for the most scrupulous historian to do full justice to Saul, as even in the early histories, and much more in the later, he is

overshadowed by David. We echo Dr. ROBINSON's wish 'that we had the story as written from Saul's point of view. If we had, we should probably see the young warrior, receiving every benefit from the King, including the hand of his own daughter, yet seeking to undermine his influence and ultimately to supersede him. It would be clear to us that the distraction in Saul's mind and the division among his people were among the main causes of his fall and final defeat.' This helps us to realize how cautiously the modern historian of Israel must tread among her pathetically scanty historical remains, and the rôle which intuition and the historical imagination must play in the reconstruction of her story.

To add to the historian's difficulties, the text is at certain, even crucial, points obscure, and it may even in places have been deliberately altered. Students interested in the Hebrew text will therefore be glad to note Dr. ROBINSON's occasional discussion of textual difficulties: for example, of the awkward passage about 'the blind and the lame' in 2 S 5⁸ (p. 215), or the revolt of Edom in 2 K 8²¹ (p. 343), or the crowning of Joash in 2 K 11¹² (p. 351), where Dr. ROBINSON shows a preference for the traditional עֲדִית (testimony) rather than Wellhausen's clever emendation זְעִירֹת (bracelets) or עֲרִיֹת.

This illustrates a certain not unreasonably conservative temper which marks the *History* generally. For example, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the twelve patriarchs are for the most part real historical personages, 'though the stories told of them (except Abraham) may often be interpreted as tribal rather than individual history.' Again, Dr. ROBINSON firmly holds to the current critical view of the date of Deuteronomy and its connexion with the reformation of Josiah, as against Welch on the one hand, and Hölischer on the other. Also he is inclined to accept the reformation of Hezekiah (2 K 18⁴), on which doubt has been cast. He also argues for a Scythian invasion of Palestine about 626 B.C., which has hitherto served as a historical background for certain passages in Jeremiah and Zephaniah, but which has been called in question

by Wilke, who has been followed by several scholars; and he thinks there may be substantial accuracy in the story of Jer 11¹⁻¹⁴, that Jeremiah at first welcomed and supported the Deuteronomic movement. These contentions, whether right or wrong, show that we are dealing with the deliberate judgment of a cautious and well-informed scholar, who has not been swept off his feet by the newer criticism.

The detail in such a book as this is legion, but we are never allowed to lose the main thread of the story; and clear as is the march of the facts in the individual chapters, the conspectus of their progress is greatly facilitated by the brief but admirable summaries which precede them: and a special word of praise is due to the three exhaustive indexes of Biblical references, modern authors, and subjects treated or alluded to. Eleven maps are interspersed throughout the volume.

Interesting speculations are opened up. What a different course history might have taken, for example, if the Philistines had founded a great empire; and Dr. ROBINSON shows how very nearly that came to pass. Or what if, instead of Solomon, who was born in the purple and soon learned the manners of an Oriental potentate, one of David's older sons, who had known the hardships of his earlier life, had succeeded him? Or what if the Hebrews themselves had become a first-class world Power and founded a mighty empire? But for the disharmony that continually marred the relations between Israel and Judah despite a deep underlying unity, such an issue was by no means inconceivable. 'There is nothing impossible or fantastic,' as Dr. ROBINSON says, 'in the supposition that, in favourable circumstances, an Israelite kingdom might have arisen which should have stood in history among the world's great empires and have made an epoch in the political story of mankind.'

It is fortunate that it was otherwise ordained. Hers was the nobler task of founding a spiritual kingdom, and of enriching the world with gifts of incalculable importance to the higher life of man,

and this ultimate spiritual victory, as the writer points out, she owed largely to her ultimate political insignificance. Doubtless there was in the life of Israel something unique from the start. Her earliest codes, for example, breathe a far more deeply humanitarian spirit than the codes of other ancient peoples, noble in many respects as some of these are: and Dr. ROBINSON traces the secret of much of Israel's greatness to her early experience of nomadism. In that period she learned that love of liberty, that respect for personality, that insistence upon human rather than material values, in general that democratic temper, which remains with her more or less to this day. The prophets saw that her salvation, when she entered the 'cultural' stage, lay in the maintenance of the stern traditions she had inherited from the earlier period.

Many aspects of the discussion will appeal as much to the layman as to the scholar. Among these are the fine estimate of the complex character of David, the summary of the prophetic teaching, and the section of Life in Israel under the Monarchy, which reminds one of Bertholet's 'History of Hebrew Civilization.' Scholars will be interested to note that on the origin of the Decalogue he is non-committal—of the theory which ascribes it to Moses 'it can only be said that it seems to be capable neither of proof nor of disproof'—while he seems to incline to the view that it was among the Kenites that Moses learned to know Jahweh. He is certainly right, as Weinrich has conclusively shown, in believing that Isaiah's attitude to politics was primarily religious; and exegetes will be interested in his interpretation of the famous passage in Is 7^{14ff.}: 'If a woman were to conceive now and the child were born in due time, then, before it could tell the difference between good and bad, pleasant and unpleasant, Jerusalem would be safe, and the two threatening kings would have perished.'

Dr. ROBINSON concludes by reminding us that Israel's threefold legacy to the world was her democratic conception of monarchy, her great literature, and her religion. When the Christian Church broke loose from the Jewish community, she was in reality just liberating the ideals which

counted for most in Judaism itself. Her religion was her supreme contribution to human welfare; and the story of the social, political, and international forces among which that religion arose and developed, by which its expression was in part conditioned, and against which it had frequently to assert itself, is told by Dr. ROBINSON with a wealth of detail, with a sense of perspective, with an eye for the salient things, and with an accuracy of scholarship which are likely to make it the standard book on this period of Israel's history for many a day to come.

What is Mysticism? Most diverse answers would be given to that question, for the name has vastly different meanings and associations to different minds. To some it represents the topmost height of religious fervour and Christian attainment; to others it suggests the dethronement of reason and the perilous visions of a disordered fancy. The Catholic Church, while acknowledging some of the Mystics as among the greatest saints, has always betrayed a certain uneasiness in regard to their experiences of ecstasy.

Books innumerable have been written about Mysticism and the Mystics, but we can think of nothing clearer and more to the point than an essay on *Christian Mysticism*, by Mr. Paul Elmer MORE (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net). It is frankly critical though by no means unappreciative, but it is especially valuable for its careful analysis of the various types of mystic experience and the interpretation to be put upon them. Though brief, it is extraordinarily close knit and full of matter.

All mysticism is not Christian, as is evident to any one who has the slightest knowledge of Hindu or Muhammadan religious experience. Mystical experience may be found on three planes, which at the one end fall short of normal Christian experience, and at the other end go beyond it. On the first plane we have 'a conviction of supernatural realities accompanied with a sense of the illusory nature of the phenomenal world.' This is really

the pre-requisite of all religion. It is found equally in Plato and in St. Paul. 'Strictly speaking, it is not mysticism, though often so named, and does not necessarily lead to mysticism.' On the second plane there is 'an immediate contact with supernatural reality, whether given through sensuous sights and sounds or by spiritual communications.' This belongs more properly to the field of mystic experience, but still is rather a quasi than an absolute Mysticism. 'As a rule, in this plane of experience the supernatural, with the advance of culture, takes the form of a single entity, at once infinite and personal, which reveals itself to the human soul by an act of grace.' On the third plane we reach complete Mysticism, which implies 'absorption of the soul in the supernatural reality, whether conceived as a pancosmic or a transcendental Absolute.' It is here that Mysticism passes beyond the bounds of Christian faith, and even of theism. 'The notion of personality, whether in the soul or in the Absolute, becomes a part of the illusion to be transcended, and the final state is inexpressible in the terms of theistic devotion, or even in the language of vision.' Much of what is currently known as Christian Mysticism hovers ambiguously between the second and third planes, and so has given rise to the diverse judgments of approval and disapproval passed upon it.

There is a strong mystic element in Plato, with his emphasis on the world of ideas as the eternal and only real. 'But mystery and the mystical mood it engenders, though our speech fails to observe the difference with due precision, are not the same thing as mysticism; and to jump to the conclusion that the Platonist, because he possesses a key to the invisible world of Ideas, is therefore a mystic, would be to throw the whole range of noetic experience into disorder.' Plato's conception of Ideas as entities in themselves precludes any theory of knowledge as a coalescence of the knower and the known. That conception came with the Neoplatonism of Plotinus. 'In truth this is the decisive point of difference between Platonism and Neoplatonism: whether the utmost reach of wisdom is to discern Ideas as objective facts, or whether there is a state beyond this,

wherein nothing externally regulative of the reason remains, but Ideas become the property of its own activity, and the distinction between subject and object, knower and known, disappears.' And here is the point at which full-blown Mysticism parts company with the Christian faith.

It was undoubtedly the influence of Neoplatonic philosophy that led to a full development of Mysticism within the Christian Church. A strong bulwark against excess lay in the Hebrew conception of God as intensely personal and in the doctrine of the Incarnation. Such a Being could not be attenuated to a mystical abstraction without extreme violence to the authoritative records. In writers like Gregory Nazianzen and Augustine there is much that has a mystical ring about it, but they keep within the bounds of Christian thought and are worlds away from Plotinus's ideal of absorption in the divine. But later, through the influence of the Pseudo-Dionysius there came the great development of mediæval mysticism. It set out to find God by the *via negativa*, which means simply that 'by a process of denial we reach ultimately the same goal as by a process of affirmation, that by a successive surrender of all claims to know anything we attain at last to the utmost knowing.'

The progress of the soul along the mystic way is variously described but generally in accordance with Bonaventura's three stages of the *via purgativa*, the *via contemplativa*, and the *via unitiva*. In the first stage the soul must be utterly purged from sense, for every satisfaction of the senses, however innocent, is a barrier to the soul's progress. This includes all memories, visions, revelations that come to the soul in sensuous form. St. John of the Cross explicitly says: 'We picture to ourselves Christ on the Cross, or bound to a pillar, or God sitting on His throne in great majesty. . . . All these imaginations and apprehensions are to be emptied out of the soul.' In the second stage the spiritual faculties of the soul must themselves be benumbed or purged away. Memory and imagination must be quenched, the understanding be blinded, and the will cease to strive. And so at

last, in this dark night of the spirit, in this self-imposed vacuity, we come to a union with God, a state in which infinite darkness is one with infinite light.

It is obvious that the *via negativa* is something different from the highway of Christian salvation, and, however scriptural the language of Mysticism may be, it is difficult to reconcile its underlying assumptions with the central tenets of the Christian faith. It cannot easily escape the charge of quietism with its complete passivity of the will. Its doctrine of love expressly excludes the second of the great commandments, for, in the words of St. John of the Cross, 'He who loves the creature becomes vile as that creature itself. . . . He, therefore, who loves anything besides God renders his soul incapable of the divine union. . . . This applies to every kind of affection to which we are liable in this life.' All the symbolism whereby earthly things become pictures of the heavenly is thrust aside. The very sacraments become a hindrance, and even Christ Himself is left behind when the soul wings its lone way to the uttermost darkness which is beyond all light.

It need hardly be said that the thoroughgoing mystic is not always logical, and, like many others, is often more Christian than his creed. But 'essential mysticism, so soon as it passes beyond the first plane, is something quite different from the genteel presentation of it by popular expounders who mingle the three planes without discrimination, and then sentimentalize the mixture.' 'Mysticism is a disease of religion, and not its perfection, and the effort to lose our sense of responsible being in the gaping abyss of the unconscious is a temptation of the spirit just as surely as the surrender in the opposite direction is a temptation of the flesh. . . . As for the Christian, let him not suppose that a humility content to abide within the limits of traditional orthodoxy, with no passion for the immediate vision of God, is a lowering of his religious or philosophic courage. Rather let him be assured that in this voluntary inhibition lies the act of heroic faith and noblest endeavour. To believe seriously in the other world of God and

Ideas, to lift the mind habitually to the contemplation of supernatural realities until it learns of a certainty that its home is there, to live in that realm whole-heartedly, yet without shirking or denying the claims of Nature to centre the distracted will upon God as the King of righteousness, to retain faith in a divine purpose at work within the world despite all the persuasions of infinite illusion, to take one's part valiantly in the eternal conflict of truth—that is not a light choice or a feeble task. Against the temptation to sink below this mediatorial plane we have, to him who listens, a clear call of the spirit; the ambition to rise, here and now, into what allures us as a higher plane is equally a temptation, however it be disguised.'

Prayer: A Study in the History and Psychology of Religion, by Friedrich HEILER, Dr.Theol., Dr.Phil., Professor of the History of Religions in the University of Marburg, was published in German during the War and went through five editions. It was fitting that the English translation should be made by one who is himself a recognized student of the subject—Dr. Samuel McCOMB (assisted by Dr. J. Edgar PARK). The translation is published by Mr. Milford at the Oxford University Press. As the book runs to three hundred and seventy-six pages it was presumably inevitable that the price should be sixteen shillings. When will it be possible to publish important theological books at a price within the reach of the average clergyman?

The volume represents an amazing amount of industry. In the fifth German edition there were more than two thousand quotations. Dr. HEILER's range of sympathy is as wide as his range of reading. When he wrote this book he was a member of the Roman communion. He writes with respect even of some of the more repulsive developments of Roman mysticism on its erotic side. Even at that time he had 'fought his way up to an œcumenical position through his studies and experience of life.' No one who reads this book will be surprised to learn that he has since joined the Lutheran communion and has kindly relations with the Anglican

and the Eastern Orthodox Churches. Even in his Roman Catholic days he recognized John Bunyan as England's greatest religious genius.

The average man has only one question to ask about prayer: Does God answer prayer? In other words, prayer is popularly conceived as petition, and usually as petition for earthly blessings, not much above the level of the prayer of primitive man. Many people to-day have satisfied themselves that 'God does not answer prayer,' and that that settles the matter. Moreover, when they speak of 'God answering prayer,' they always mean 'God granting their petitions,' however foolish and unreasonable these may be. The possibility that a divine answer to prayer may take the form of a wise and loving refusal to grant a petition does not occur to them.

Yet many of the prayers in the Old Testament Psalms and many non-Christian prayers contain no petitions and no expression of wants. They are simply utterances of confidence in God: 'In thee, O Lord, do I put my trust.' Luther also speaks of 'abandoned prayer.' The petitioner begins by making his claim on God; and then, in a mood of joyful resignation, withdraws it, leaving the issue to God. 'If it be possible, let this cup pass from me . . . nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt.' In praying for the sick elector Johannsen, Luther first threatens God that he will throw down his keys and bring no more honour and tribute; then, as it were in humble, trustful repentance, he adds: 'O Lord, we are Thine, do with us as Thou wilt, only give us patience.'

Among the Mystics, some have gone further still, and denied that petition, even supplication for spiritual gifts and mercies, is ever permissible for the Christian. 'The soul,' says Francis of Sales, 'has no other attitude towards God than that of waiting, which excludes fear and hope as symptoms of egoism.' Madame Guyon assured Bossuet 'that she was incapable of asking God for anything in prayer.' Quietist Mysticism rejects even the prayer of praise and thanksgiving, since this also is an act of one's own will. Among the recorded

prayers of Jesus, only one is an outburst of joy (Mt 11²⁵).

Primitive man has no such scruples. He prays for the things of this world, and for nothing else. It is only in later days, as at the height of Greek civilization or among the prophets of Israel, that religious experience is moralized and petition for moral values becomes the centre of prayer.

When this stage is reached there is a tendency to regard petitions for earthly things as among the childish things that have been put away. As Augustine says: 'Ask nothing from God except God Himself.' 'Ask for the blessed life,' says Augustine again, and for him prayer for material goods is 'carnal prayer.'

Yet outside of Mysticism, the robust sense of men of prayer has refused to accept this limitation of its scope. In the Old Testament a common theme of impassioned prayer was national independence and greatness. James exhorts to prayer for the sick. Large sections of the Church will accept the succinct creed of Thomas Aquinas, following Augustine: 'It is permissible to pray for whatever it is permissible to desire.' Jesus Himself taught His disciples to pray for their daily bread, and it was only the philosophizing tendencies of later days that transformed this into a petition for spiritual food.

In our day natural science has taught that natural law is immutable; and so the conclusion has been widely drawn that prayer in the sense of petition is as foolish as it is vain. Prayer, therefore, in the traditional sense has been largely abandoned, not only in intellectual circles, but even among the masses in our great cities, who get vague impressions of the general trend of scientific thought without much knowledge of detail. Much philosophical writing has tended in the same direction. If God is the 'First Unmoved Mover' of Aristotle, or the 'Anima Mundi' of the Stoics, or the 'grand être' of Auguste Comte, then not only prayer as petition, but prayer in its true meaning of trustful intercourse with God, becomes perilously near an absurdity. It is then a

temporary educational expedient, useful only for the spiritually immature. As Kant says: 'He who has made progress in the good life ceases to pray, for candour is one of its first maxims.'

By its explanation that the apparent answer to prayer for spiritual strength and comfort is only a reflex action of the mind of him who prays, psychology has also played its part in the destruction of the belief in the efficacy of prayer. If this is all that is in it, then there is nothing in it. An answer to prayer which depends on self-deception is no answer.

Yet in spite of Science and Philosophy, multitudes of Christians and multitudes who are not Christians continue to pray, and continue to find their life infinitely enriched and strengthened as a result of their prayers. Poets and artists, for example, have often seen more truly into the heart of the universe than men whose main concern was scientific generalization or philosophical abstraction. In Beethoven's diary we come upon the following prayer: 'Serenely I will submit to all changes and I will put my whole confidence, O God, only in Thine unchangeable goodness.'

The question concerns not the accidents but the essence of Christianity. Bousset has called Christianity 'the religion of prayer.' For Söderblom, Christianity is the peculiar home of personal prayer; or, as Dr. HEILER puts it quite simply: 'To be a Christian means to be one who prays.'

But many have to revise their conception of prayer. There is what may be called, not inaptly if somewhat irreverently, 'the pump-handle view of prayer.' If the blessings asked for are poured out, then we 'believe in prayer'; if not, we disbelieve. But there is nothing mechanical in prayer. A certain state of mind is presupposed in him who prays. The efficacy of the prayer for forgiveness depends on the presence of the forgiving spirit; and a moment's reflection will convince us that answers to prayer would be meaningless if they came without regard to the moral health, the humility, the repentance of him who prays, without

regard to his confidence in God and sense of dependence on Him.

'Ask, and ye shall receive.' But the asking to which Jesus refers is something more than mechanical and verbal petition. It is a quest with the whole being, an earnest knocking with the spirit at the doors of the treasure-house of God's grace. Moreover, before we receive what we ask, there is a price to be paid. The reason for much unanswered prayer is that God knows we are not willing to pay the price. The blessings, even the spiritual blessings, for which we ask, can be given only to those who are prepared to receive them. The sons of Zebedee prayed that, when Jesus came in His Kingdom, they might have the places of honour on His right hand and His left. Could they have looked forward a little and seen Jesus on His cross, with a cross on either side, would they still have prayed that prayer?

When the man in the street tells us that God does not answer prayer, he has a pitifully inadequate conception of what prayer is. Prayer is something more than a 'demand note.' To the man of to-day, dominated by Copernicus and Kant and the teaching of modern science, prayer is at worst foolishness, and at best a stumbling-block. Some in their distress take refuge in a kind of substitute for prayer, a vague, devotional mood or æsthetic contemplation. But the man who comes to God through Jesus Christ knows whom he has believed. He knows he has direct and living fellowship with God, a communion which does not exclude petition, but in which petition is but one element; a communion which finds room for adoration and thanksgiving, for confession and intercession, but refuses to be limited by any theological categories.

In prayer the Christian speaks face to face with God as a man speaks with his friend. It is for Science and Philosophy not to deny the facts of the prayer world, but to explain them as best they can, if so they choose. In the phrase of Ménégoz, the religious man will decisively affirm prayer 'in its entirely non-rational character and with all its difficulties.'

The Kingdom of God Movement in Japan.

BY THE REVEREND WILLIAM AXLING, B.A., D.D., TOKYO.

THE Kingdom of God Movement in Japan is root and branch an indigenous movement. It is a vital and vivid demonstration of the fact that Christianity is no longer an alien faith but has struck root in the soil of that Empire and has become part and parcel of the nation's life. It indicates that Christianity has gotten into the blood and runs in the veins and arteries of the Japanese people.

This significant movement was born in the brain and heart of Toyohiko Kagawa. In 1928 when representative Christian leaders of fifty-seven nations were gathered at Jerusalem for that epoch-making meeting on the Mount of Olives, Kagawa, one of Japan's elected delegates but unable to attend, in accordance with his custom was spending the Passion Week in fasting, meditation, and prayer.

Moved by a mystic sense of the creative possibilities of that gathering on Olivet he, twelve thousand miles away, spent the long hours of that week in passionate intercession in its behalf. While keeping that sacred tryst with God there flashed across his soul a Divine mandate to launch in Japan a great forward-looking, forward-moving evangelistic effort.

This vision came to him in an hour when his soul was clear-eyed and far-seeing as the result of long continued open-hearted fellowship with God. Back of it, however, there lay an historical approach. His study of the Huguenot movement in France had deeply impressed him with the fact that the power of Christianity to fashion the moral, social, political, and religious ideals of a nation and mould its total life is dependent upon the momentum of its impact.

The qualitative phase of the Christian impact is necessarily the most important and the most dynamic, but the quantitative force of that impact is also a creative factor. This observation aroused in him the conviction that if the Christian faith is to infiltrate every phase of Japan's life and become the norm in all her ways it must have at least one million followers.

This conviction, based on historical facts and the vision which flashed upon his soul in one of its luminous moments, both pointed in the same direction. They indicated that the hour had struck for the Christian forces of Japan to launch out into a great spiritual adventure.

An All Christians Crusade.—It is one thing to see a vision, it is quite a different thing to share it with others in such a way that it will illumine their hearts, fire their imaginations, and stir in them the crusading spirit. Whenever and wherever Kagawa made known his vision and attempted to lay the Heaven-sent mandate on other hearts he ran into a solid wall of doubts, difficulties, and towering question marks.

Seventy years of heroic endeavour had produced only three hundred thousand Christians in Japan, including the Greek and Roman Catholic communions. How could any movement, no matter how all-inclusive its constituency or far-reaching its scope, within any reasonable time push the number of Christians in this land up to so full a figure?

Kagawa's faith, however, feeds on difficulties. His God is the God of the impossible. Once convinced that God has spoken, obstacles are transformed into challenges. He asks neither why nor how, but follows the gleam.

Incessantly he kept the vision before his friends and followers. Every plan and purpose were focused toward bringing it into the realm of reality. After a period of quiet cultivation within a circle of kindred spirits, he laid it on the heart and conscience of the officers of the National Christian Council of Japan, and both the Executive and the Commission on Evangelism of this representative body put themselves whole-souledly back of plans for its realization.

This organization mothered the project, and through its Commission on Evangelism a Central Committee, representing most of the communions and Christian groups of the Empire, was set up to carry the movement forward to its goal. This committee took six months to mature its plans and to mobilize the Christian forces. Ninety interdenominational Regional Committees were organized across the Empire in order to give autonomous powers to cities and communities in initiating and organizing local campaigns and to create a consciousness of solidarity throughout the nation-wide Christian community.

The movement as such was launched January 1, 1930, with simultaneous campaigns in the six largest cities of the Empire. It started as a Kagawa movement. His is still the colourful and potent

personality around which it is centred. Since its inception, however, it has gathered such momentum that to-day it is no longer a one-man movement. It has expanded into an All Christians Crusade.

In this crusade we are witnessing a spectacle seen only in the early Christian centuries. Here practically all of the Christians of an entire Empire are pooling their prayer-power, their soul-power, their man-power, their collective experience, and their material resources in a nation-wide all-inclusive evangelistic effort.

This movement knows no East or West, no North or South. It sweeps the Empire four-square. It knows no denominational differences. It leaps across sectarian barriers. Through it the Christians of Japan, interrelated and unified, are moving out into the pagan world around them with an unbroken front.

A Passion to Pioneer.—There breathes through this movement the spirit of the pioneers and the trail-blazers. During the past seventy years Christian activity in Japan has been centred largely in her fast-expanding cities. While this has been in accord with Paul's missionary policy it has left great outlying areas untouched with the gospel message.

30,000,000 farmers, 5,500,000 industrial workers, 1,500,000 fishing folk, 500,000 miners, great groups of the 2,500,000 students, 1,000,000 toilers in the field of transportation, and another 1,000,000 employed on public works are still unreached. The Christian Church in that land has drawn its converts largely from the great middle class, with a strong mixture of students and accessions from the professional classes.

The leaders in this movement feel that they have been given a mandate from God to push out the frontiers of the Christian occupation and raise the flag of Christ in these neglected areas. They plan to work their way into every group of the population, so that no class shall be able to say, 'The Christian Church has no thought for us; no man cares for our souls.' This is a goal which has not as yet been reached in any land. Missions to the rural villages, the factory areas, the fishing fields, the mining camps, the labourers, and the great student centres hold a central place in the movement's programme.

A Full-Orbed Programme.—This is an evangelistic movement. It centres in evangelism. During the years 1930 and 1931, 3000 evangelistic meetings were held for the masses; 2400 of the 2800 Protestant churches of the Empire participated in these meetings. Many of the remaining 400

churches are in territory not as yet reached by the movement.

These meetings covered all the cities, many of the larger towns, and some of the rural centres of population. Over half a million people attended them. Of that number 26,746 signed cards as inquirers. This is an average of one signature in every twenty of those in attendance, and opens a window into the spiritual hunger of the Japanese heart. It also reveals the unparalleled Christian opportunity in that land at the present time.

Those who are pouring their life's blood into this crusade cannot forget, however, that men and women live in communities and work in groups, and that this community life and group life are determining factors in the making or the breaking of men, women, and even children.

This movement, therefore, sets up as one of its major goals the humanizing and Christianizing of the social and the industrial order. It is definitely out to Christianize every human relationship; the relation of the ruler and the ruled, the capitalist and the labourer, the employer and employee, and the owner and the tenant. It is endeavouring to make Jesus' way of life, His values, His standards, and His spirit the norm, and actually operative wherever man meets man, where women work and weep, and where children are not getting a fair and full chance.

As an outstanding feature of an out-and-out evangelistic movement this is unique, and puts this crusade in a class by itself. It puts heavy emphasis on the social phase of the Christian programme, a phase which some sections of the Church of the West tragically neglect and other sections of that Church repudiate on the ground that it is not a legitimate part of its work in the world.

As one means of realizing this goal, the movement is bringing together Christian factory owners and Christians employing labourers in large numbers in round table conferences for the purpose of studying from the Christian point of view such fundamental questions as capitalism, the relation of the employer and the employee, wages, hours, housing conditions, and other acute problems in the industrial world.

In order to eliminate the acquisitive motive, the cut-throat competition, and the goal of personal profit from the present-day industrial and economic order, and create in their place the spirit of co-operation and service, the movement urges the organization of mutual aid guilds in every church, and producers and consumers co-operatives in every community.

The Second Mile.—This movement is being carried

forward on a high tide of sacrificial service. Just previous to the launching of this venture, Kagawa, saying that he wished to do something more, something above, something beyond what he was already doing to win Japan for Christ, voluntarily put himself in the hands of the Central Committee for a period of three years. He declared that he would serve anywhere and at any time as a crusader in this crusade. He, however, laid down one condition. He stipulated that he would not accept a single shilling out of the funds of the movement as salary or remuneration. He insisted that his work in connexion with it should be extra and above his regular and usual programme.

His three social settlements, one in Tokyo, one in Osaka, and one in Kobe, are each of them a big job for a big man. Yet he carried them financially and in every way on his own lone shoulders. In spite of this he declared that he was not satisfied, wanted to do something more, and do it without remuneration.

That lead became contagious. Two executive secretaries are devoting great blocks of their time to this movement. Some forty people are serving on its Central Committee. More than six hundred are serving on the ninety Regional Committees. Between fifty and sixty Japanese pastors, evangelists, Christian educators, laymen, laywomen, and missionaries are giving great areas of their time out in the field crusading as evangelists to the masses. These are busy people with crowded programmes. Yet all have adopted the motto that their work in connexion with this crusade must be the second mile with Christ, a bigger bit for their fellow-men.

This evangelistic drive has in a measure recaptured the crusading spirit of the Early Church and is being carried forward through a vast voluntary outpouring of life and effort. With the exception of the clerks in the office and the full-time editor of the *Kingdom of God Weekly*, the official organ of the movement, no one related to this venture is receiving a salary out of the funds of the movement.

Church Centric.—This movement has lifted the Christian cause in the Japanese Empire above narrow sectarian issues and goals, and thrust it out on a plane with wide horizons. But it is not anti-Church, or non-Church, or super-Church in its motive and purpose. It magnifies the Christian Church. It believes that this institution has across the centuries garnered into its life and experience a cultural and spiritual heritage of inestimable value. This heritage it strives not only to conserve but to enrich.

Although many of the meetings for the masses are held in theatres and public auditoriums the local pastors and Christians are made the organizing and directing forces. Moreover, the results of these meetings are in every way possible directed into the local churches. It is the policy of the Central Committee, however, not to assist in local campaigns through furnishing funds and supplying speakers unless such campaigns are a united effort of the majority of the communions and churches of that area.

An Educational Technique.—There throbs through this movement a passion to evangelize the masses, and in every phase of its programme it sounds the evangelistic note. The driving force back of it, however, is not a shallow effervescent emotionalism. It is balanced and stabilized by an educational technique.

The unfinished task in Japan will never be carried to completion by missionaries sent out from the older Churches of the West. Neither can the great unreached classes and masses be evangelized by paid Japanese pastors and evangelists, unless we are satisfied to postpone the evangelization of that nation to the far, far distant future.

Impelled by this conviction, the leaders of this crusade are endeavouring to raise up an army of at least five thousand lay preachers—laymen and laywomen who, in the communities where they live and in the circles in which they move, will as they go about their daily tasks hold up the torch of Christ and give ardent testimony of their Christian faith and experience to kith and kin, to friends and fellow-townsfolk.

For the purpose of training the laity for effective participation in the campaign, also with a view to nurturing the inquirers enlisted in its various meetings, Training Institutes for Christians are held in every city and centre of population. During 1931 thirty-one such institutes were held in the different parts of the Empire. These were attended by ten thousand four hundred delegated Christians, chosen by the churches of the area covered by the institutes because of some special qualification to become a part of this army of lay evangelists.

Moreover, in order to push forward the drive into the unoccupied rural regions, the movement is putting special emphasis on the holding of Peasant Gospel Schools. Japan's 30,000,000 farmers live in thirteen thousand rural villages. All of these are virgin fields for the gospel. The future of these villages is in the hearts and hands of their youth.

A Peasant Gospel School gathers together from twenty to thirty picked young people, potential

village leaders, from as many villages in a defined rural area. For a week or ten days each year during the slack season on the farm it gives them intensive training in Bible Study, Sunday School methods, evangelism, recreational work for the young, home betterment, village betterment, and better farming.

Most of these young people return to their respective villages and start something: a Bible Class, a Sunday School, a reading club, a study group, a recreational centre, some form of village helpfulness, anything to give Christ a chance in the village and inaugurate a new day for its people. During 1931 and the first six months of 1932 seventy of these schools were held in seventy different rural sections. These schools trained a thousand young people whose lives are dedicated to the task of giving voluntary Christian leadership to the seven hundred villages from which they came.

During the present year this same technique has been adapted to meet the needs of industrial communities. Industrial Gospel Schools are being held in the cities and in the industrial centres with a view to reaching the youth of these areas and training them to render the same kind of service in their congested communities.

Another phase of the movement's educational emphasis is its large use of Christian literature. Japan is the most literate nation in the world. Her literacy stands at the remarkably high figure of 99·7, lacking only three-tenths of one per cent. of being a perfect one hundred. Her people are inveterate readers.

With the threefold object of training Christians, teaching inquirers, and evangelizing the unevangelized the movement is publishing *The Kingdom of God Weekly*. Within two years this periodical has leaped from an absolutely new undertaking in the field of publication to a weekly circulation of 30,000, and is making a most significant contribution to the Christianization of the nation.

The movement is also issuing and making extensive use of specially prepared pamphlets and tracts setting forth various phases of the Christian message. These are published and used in mass quantities. During the past two years 500,000 of these pamphlets have been sold, and 2,000,000 leaflets have been distributed among the non-Christian population.

At the suggestion of the Central Committee of the movement both the British and American Bible Societies have put out special 'Kingdom of God Movement' editions of the New Testament. In order to put them within the reach of every reader these Testaments have been priced at the extra-

ordinary low figure of three cents. Sixty thousand of these have been sold.

This use of the printed page—*The Kingdom of God Weekly*, the issuing of pamphlets and leaflets, and the specially published low-priced New Testament—is carrying the Christian message into homes and hearts far beyond the reach of the spoken word.

A Timely Movement.—Japan has fallen on troubled and turbulent times. Within and without there are turmoil and conflict. The dominant factors underlying this unrest are economic and social.

Back of her drive into Manchuria is the pressure of over-population, 2722 people on every square mile of her cultivatable land, 65,000,000 people crowded on to 147,440 square miles of land, 85 per cent. of which is mountainous.

Finding that the saturation point had been reached on the farms which have sustained her people through the centuries, Japan twenty-five years ago turned her thought and energy toward industrialization. In this field she was forging ahead with feverish haste and marvellous success when she ran pell-mell into the tangle of tariffs, quotas, and embargoes in every part of the world. These threaten to bring her industries and commerce to a standstill.

Moreover, discriminatory legislation in America, Canada, Australia, and Brazil putting a ban on her immigrants seriously aggravated her problems. This legislation and the towering tariff barriers built across all Western nations have driven Japan back on her mountainous islands, and shifted her 'life line' to Manchuria, as the only remaining area from which she can secure food supplies and the raw materials necessary for the industrial programme on which her population, increasing at the rate of from 800,000 to 1,000,000 a year, is dependent for work and wages and life itself.

She has 2,500,000 students in her higher educational institutions; 700,000 in her secondary schools, 1,500,000 in her technical schools, and 300,000 in her universities and graduate schools. During the past five years eighty per cent. of the graduates of these schools have failed to secure employment.

The lot of her labourer has been a hard one. Wages have been low, hours long, and living conditions often bad. During and following the World War things took a turn for the better. A factory law favouring the labourer was passed. Agitation and pressure forced many employers to adopt an eight-hour day, increase the wage scale and provide better living conditions. The economic slump and

unemployment, however, have checked this advance in her labour world, and there is danger that conditions will drift back to what they were.

The peasants as a class are fighting a losing fight with adverse conditions. All are heavily in debt. Many are pitifully poor. Multitudes of them are at the mercy of absentee landlords to whom they must pay from fifty-five to seventy per cent. of all that they raise.

All of the above three classes—the students, the labourers, and the peasants—furnish a fertile field for communistic propaganda, and many of them are to-day avowed and aggressive followers of Karl Marx.

Because they were looked upon as a counter influence, ultra-patriots and ultra-nationalists have been given a free hand. In the name of patriotism these ultras have been allowed to resort to force and violence in order to forward their cause. Gradually this movement gathered such momentum that there were scores of bands organized under various names all over the country. Finally, a fiery patriotism flowered into a fiery fanaticism, and before the government knew what had happened it had a full-fledged Fascist movement on its hands.

These Fascists turned their guns on two classes, the corrupt politicians and the greedy capitalists—on the ground that the corruption of the one and the greed of the other make them inimical to the State. The politicians and the capitalists in Japan have for many years been an interlocking directorate manipulating, for their mutual advantage, the

nation's political and economic life. These Fascists are in revolt against this whole situation and are espousing the cause of the common man.

Thus the Communists, the Fascists, and the Christians through the Kingdom of God Movement are in Japan to-day in a life-and-death struggle to win the common man for their respective ideals and causes. On the outcome of this struggle hangs that nation's destiny.

Japan's present pains are birth pangs. She will emerge from these agonies with a chastened soul. Is it a matter of mere chance that at this critical hour in her history Kagawa should have come on the scene and the Kingdom of God Movement come to the birth, both pointing her to Christ and His gospel as the way out?

The Dynamic of the Movement.—This movement puts heavy emphasis on human relations and on the humanizing and Christianizing of these relations. It is not, however, a so-called humanistic movement. This crusade is rooted in God. It summons men to rethink God, to rediscover God, to re-explore God, and to re-experience God. It challenges men to make life, the whole of life, a conscious crusading venture with God.

Its dynamic is Christ and the Cross. All who are engaged in this high adventure are profoundly convinced that Christ, and Christ alone, can meet Japan's dire needs, individual, social, and national, and the Cross, and the Cross alone, can furnish a dynamic mighty enough to move that nation onward and upward to its God-given goal.

In Spirit and in Truth: An Exposition of St. John iv. 16=24.

BY THE VENERABLE A. E. J. RAWLINSON, D.D., ARCHDEACON OF AUCKLAND.

THE meaning of the passage in St. John's Gospel in which Jesus discusses with a woman of Samaria the true worship of God has been sometimes, I think, misunderstood. I write thus tentatively, and in the first person singular, because it is the purpose of this article not to lay down the law, but to invite readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES to consider the passage afresh for themselves, and to ask themselves whether or not I am right in the interpretation which I would suggest. The

terms 'spirit' and 'truth,' which are prominent in the paragraph under discussion, are to be ranked (it is to be feared) among that large number of New Testament expressions which, on the ground of their modern associations, are apt to appear to possess for the modern reader a quite delusive simplicity, and to give rise to a radical, though frequently unrecognized, misunderstanding. Thus, it is common in modern English to take 'truth' as meaning 'sincerity' or 'truthfulness,' and to under-

stand 'spirit' as standing in implied antithesis either to 'letter' (in a quite non-Pauline sense),¹ or else to either 'matter' or 'form'; so that to the modern reader the word 'spiritual' is apt to mean either 'immaterial' or 'formless' or 'non-literal.' But is this what the terms in question mean in the New Testament? 'God' (so the famous verse runs, in the familiar English translation) 'is a Spirit; and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.' Does the first half of this sentence mean simply that God is a non-material or incorporeal Being—that He is (in the phrase of one of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England) 'without body, parts, or passions'? And does the second half of the verse mean that the true worship ought to be formless, a kind of *outwardly unexpressed* lifting up of the heart towards God on the part of individuals, or, at the least, that it ought to be an essentially 'inward,' and (in *that* sense 'spiritual') worship; and, at the same time, that it must of course be sincere? I cannot bring myself to suppose that the Evangelist's meaning is either quite so obvious or (must I say it?) quite so *banal* as such an interpretation of his words would imply; and, with all diffidence, I would suggest an alternative reading of the passage.

The word *πνεῦμα* (*pneuma*), or 'spirit,' bears, no doubt, in the New Testament, as it does also in later and in earlier literature, a variety of meanings; but, in the great majority of the passages in which it is used, it connects in thought both with the Old Testament idea of the *ruach* or 'spirit' of God, and with the belief, or (to speak more accurately) the glad realization—a belief, and a realization, which are in the highest degree characteristic of the New Testament outlook—that, in the New Age (which has now at length, in a most real sense, dawned), the 'Spirit,' according to promise, has in very truth been 'outpoured'; so that the activities of the 'Spirit' are manifest, and the 'gifts' or 'workings' of the 'Spirit' are in evidence, both in the lives of Christians individually and in the corporate

life of the Christian Church as an organized body. The Christian life as a whole was regarded as being lived 'in the Spirit'; and by 'the Spirit' was meant the supernaturally energizing, inwardly operative, but at the same time outwardly manifest, activity of God; the Source of the strange new awareness of exaltation and fellowship, and at the same time of the confident faith, joy, and power, which were among the marks of the new Brotherhood. The 'Spirit' is, in a word, God Himself, unmistakably actual, concretely working, with power, in the lives of men; and when the Evangelist writes the first half of the verse I have quoted, he means that God is—*not* 'a' Spirit, but—'Spirit,' in the sense which I have indicated. God is (as it were) *essentially* 'Spirit'; He is, as to the very core of His being, Actuality, Life, supernatural Energy, Power. And the true worship of God must be in accordance with this: it must be what the worship of the Christian Church (according to the New Testament) is, namely, a worship inspired by the 'Spirit,' a worship which is *in* 'Spirit,' in the sense of being itself an expression, an external manifestation, of the activity and working of the Divine, supernatural 'Spirit' in the Church. In the days before Jesus was glorified, says the Evangelist, 'there was as yet no "Spirit"' (Jn 7³⁹): but the days before Jesus was glorified are now past; and in the New Testament Church there *is* 'Spirit.'

And so likewise there is 'truth'; 'truth,' not in the merely subjective sense of sincerity, but in the sense in which 'truth' is 'in Jesus.' 'I am the way' (says the Christ of this Gospel), 'the truth, and the life.' 'This' (says the same, or a kindred, writer) 'is the true' (*i.e.* the genuine) 'God, and eternal life' (1 Jn 5²⁰): for 'the darkness is past: the true light now shineth' (1 Jn 2⁸). Christians are, in a word, *in* 'Him that is true' (1 Jn 5²⁰); which is as much as to say that, for them, the religion of 'types and shadows' is ended; they have been led forth *ex umbris et imaginibus in veritatem*.

The suggestion, accordingly, which I would desire to make is that St. John 4¹⁶⁻²⁴ ought to be read not as a somewhat platitudinous statement of the inevitable and necessary 'inwardness' and sincerity of all truly acceptable worship of God, but as a description (in the form of a prophecy) of that new Christian *cultus* which, by the time that this Gospel was written, was already in the world. (That there may have been—that very likely there actually *was*—an historical basis behind the Fourth Evangelist's tradition of our Lord's conversation

¹ The antithesis of 'letter' and 'spirit' in the New Testament occurs in 2 Co 3⁶ and in Ro 2²⁹ 7⁶, and involves always an allusion, implied or explicit, to the contrast between the two 'covenants' of Jer 31³¹. The two 'covenants' are differentiated by the fact that in the one case the Law is written outwardly by the Divine 'Finger' on tables of stone, in the other it is written inwardly by the Divine 'Spirit' on human hearts. The contrast is therefore between the 'letter' in the sense of the outwardly written Law, and the New Testament 'gift' of the Holy Spirit.

with the Samaritan woman need not be denied ; but that there was any actual eavesdropper, who overheard and reported the conversation, is most unlikely. The Evangelist's account must presumably be held to be, at least in the main, his own free and dramatic composition ; it is legitimate, upon any reasonable view, to interpret it primarily in relation to the background of first-century Church life, rather than in relation to the actual background of the historical life of our Lord upon earth.) The interpretation of the passage, taken broadly, would then be somewhat as follows :

The Lord, in the course of His conversation with the woman, directs that her husband be summoned, with the result that the woman's sin comes to light. She has had five husbands ; she is now an adulteress ; and she at once changes the subject. She desires to divert the talk into less searching and less intimate channels. There had been a controversy of old standing between the Jews and the Samaritans with regard to the true place of worship. There had been, in times past, a Samaritan temple on Mount Gerizim ; the Jewish Maccabæan king, John Hyrcanus, had laid it in ruins in 129 B.C., but it was still for the Samaritan people the traditional holy place, the sacred mountain on which their 'fathers' had worshipped, whereas the Jews said that 'in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship.' Would the new Prophet, therefore, instead of embarrassingly discussing her sins, give a ruling, which might have the effect of settling the controversy, and of deciding finally the true place of worship ? The Lord, as requested, takes up the new theme ; and He proclaims the old controversy to be from henceforth at an end. There had been a sense, certainly, in which the Jews had been right, and the Samaritans wrong ; for to the Jews had been granted a 'knowledge' which the Samaritans had not possessed—'salvation *is* from the Jews.' Nevertheless, 'the hour cometh, when *neither* in Jerusalem, *nor* in this mountain, shall ye worship the Father.'

Yes, the Jews had been right in the past ; and to the Jew had been granted a true knowledge of God. The Old Testament system of worship, the ancient priestly and institutional *cultus* at Jerusalem, had been a system divinely enjoined. Only, now, that which was perfect was come ; and the new worship replaced and superseded the old. The Romans, in actual fact, had, before the Fourth Gospel came to be written, swept away the Jewish system of worship ; so that men worshipped God now, with the old rites, *neither* in Jerusalem *nor* in the Samaritan mountain. There was a new

system of institutional worship now in the world—a worship not limited to any one special locality. It is described as the worship of God 'in spirit and in truth.' The phrase denotes, surely, the new Christian *cultus*, to which (according to the Evangelist's mode of thought) the former systems, Samaritan and Jewish, have both alike given place.

The new *cultus*, the new system of worship, is not anything indeterminate or vague ; and the reference is primarily, not to the private prayers, or to the inner religious lives, of individuals, but to the common and corporate worship of God in the Church. What the Evangelist has in mind is the actual, concrete, historical fact of the supersession of one form of organized, corporate, institutional worship by another. I have, indeed, in my own mind no doubt but that what is meant is, in the first instance, the Eucharist—the one form of distinctively organized *cultus* of which it can be said with certainty that it is known to have existed in the Christian Church of New Testament times ; but in any case the reference must be, I think, to the actual, institutional, organized worship of God in the Church.

The new *cultus*, the new Christian worship of God, differs from the older types which it has superseded in three ways :

(1) It is not confined to one sanctuary—it may take place neither in Jerusalem, nor on Mount Gerizim, but in every place, wherever Christians are gathered together.

(2) It is a worship informed by a fuller truth, it is 'in truth,' or 'on a basis of reality,' because in Christ, who *is* the Truth, men now at length have the substance, the reality, to which former systems of worship, as 'types and shadows,' had prophetically pointed (cf. Col 2¹⁷).

(3) It is a worship offered in the power of the Spirit. Just as it is 'in the Spirit' that the new life is lived, so also it is in the power of 'Spirit' that the Christian Church worships. The new *cultus*, or worship, is a worship in 'Spirit,' because the Spirit inspires and directs it—because in the worship of Christians the mind and activity of 'Spirit' (*i.e.* the communicated, active, enabling Energy of God and of Christ) are quite plainly at work. It is, in truth, such worshippers—those, namely, whose worship is not merely sincere and inward, but inspired by 'Spirit,' as well as rooted and grounded in 'truth'—that the Father desires ; for God is Himself 'Spirit' ; and those who would worship Him must worship in 'Spirit,' as they must worship in 'truth.'

Literature.

OLD TESTAMENT ESSAYS.

MR. HERBERT LOEWE was certainly set a difficult task when he was invited to edit the *Posthumous Essays* of Harold M. Wiener, M.A., LL.B. (Milford; 7s. 6d. net), as he was not in entire sympathy with the distinctively conservative attitude to Old Testament criticism which these essays for the most part were written to defend. Over and over again Wiener speaks of the 'destructive school' of critics; the Wellhausen hypothesis as to the History of Israel and the composition of the Pentateuch he describes as 'untenable'; he even denies the existence of any real scholarship among the representatives of modern Biblical science, the scholarship of the 'rationalists' being 'fit for nothing but the comic opera stage': and while he pays Procksch the compliment of writing 'well, clearly, and with great religious insight when he lets himself go,' he describes his 'Genesis' as, though careful and learned, yet the product of a school of thought with most of whose postulates he differs *in toto*. His chief aversion is the Documentary Hypothesis, which he loses no opportunity of deriding, and he stands for predictive prophecy. Yet he was no obscurantist: for, curiously enough, he combines with this deference to tradition a certain independence of attitude; for example, he admits that the data in the Book of Kings are inconsistent, and that the text of parts of Numbers and of the narratives of the conquest must be rearranged. He died a violent death in the Jerusalem riots of 1929, in his fifty-fifth year—a death which was all the more tragic as he had spent the last few years of his life in the endeavour to reconcile Christian, Jew, and Moslem. Had he lived he might have been able to present his view of the Old Testament as a coherent whole. It is clear, however, from what he has left us, that he regarded a training in law as an indispensable qualification for any sound judgment on the Pentateuchal problem. While his range was wide, the Pentateuch was his special field, and he dealt with it not only on the historical and archæological but on the textual side.

The subjects treated in the volume are these: Isaiah and the Siege of Jerusalem, The Relations of Egypt to Israel and Judah in the Age of Isaiah, The Arrangement of Deuteronomy 12–26, The Exodus and the Southern Invasion, Some Prophecies relating to Tyre in the Light of Modern Research,

The Conquest Narratives, The Need for a Jewish Biblical Scholarship, and Some Recent Literature on the Pentateuch. This last essay contains some interesting criticism of important English and German books, among others, of Dr. Jack's argument for the early date of the Exodus, with which he disagrees, and of Meinhold's argument for the late date of the Decalogue, of which he speaks rather scathingly. Any one who resents the modern critical attitude to the Old Testament and desires to acquaint himself with the conservative approach to some of its problems, would do well to consult this book. The editor of these essays has shown a real *pietas* to the writer of them, and he is to be commended for the conscientiousness with which he has discharged his difficult task.

FROM MAZZINI TO MUSSOLINI.

It is a far cry in point of time and in the course of the strange eventful history of Italy and of Europe from the Mazzini of 1832, just emerging into public notice, to the Mussolini of 1932, the virtual dictator of Italy that Europe knows in this twentieth century. There have been numerous biographies and other books dealing with Mazzini since his death in 1872. But now, just fifty years later, we have the story of his chequered career told afresh in full and sympathetic manner under the title *Mazzini: Prophet of Modern Europe*, by Mr. Gwilym O. Griffith (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net), remembered by his excellent work on 'Paul and Bunyan.' Mazzini is undoubtedly a hero to his latest biographer, but skilful and admirable as is the whole narrative, we fail to find that it has made good the claim that he was the 'prophet of Modern Europe.' Mazzini was known and admired by Carlyle, and known and loved by Mrs. Carlyle, during his long sojourn in London as an exile from his own country. It chanced during this sojourn here that his letters were opened by the responsible Minister in Lord Palmerston's Government. This raised a violent storm of protest, during which Carlyle testified thus, by what his wife described as 'a glorious letter': 'Whatever he might think of Mr. Mazzini's skill in worldly affairs, he would with great freedom testify to all men that Mr. Mazzini, if he had ever seen one such, was a man of genius and virtue, a man of sterling veracity and nobleness of mind, one of those rare men, numerable, un-

fortunately, but as units in this world, who were worthy to be called martyr-souls, who in silence, piously in their daily life, understood and practised what was meant by that.' Mazzini was ever a conspirator, but his was a conspiracy to reconstitute the scattered provinces of Italy into 'one independent sovereign nation destined by the law and God and Humanity to form a free and equal community of brothers,' and he believed till the end of his life that 'the republican is the only form of Government that ensures this future.' It was his strange and unexpected fate to return from his exile in London to become the head of a Republican Parliament and Government in Rome from which the Pope had fled. His was the most striking, and indeed dominating, figure in that assembly, though Garibaldi also was there. This 'National Government' lasted only five months, and once again Mazzini was an exile from his native land. 'Lord Palmerston was to shock Tory sensibilities by declaring that "Mazzini's government of Rome was far better than any the Romans had had for centuries."' Mazzini was never again to be the head or even a member of any government of Italy, but Mr. Griffith maintains that he was always a powerful influence behind Cavour and Garibaldi. It was the latter who in the height of his popularity in this country paid this striking homage to his exiled compatriot: 'Among us here is a man who has performed the greatest services both to my native land and to freedom. . . . He alone was awake when all around were slumbering. . . . In him the holy fire of love for fatherland and freedom has never dimmed.' There is no finer tribute to any public man than is contained in the closing chapters of this book. When Carlyle, a lonely old man in his home in London, heard of Mazzini's death he wrote: 'A more beautiful person I never beheld. . . . He might have taken a high place in literature, but he gave himself up as a sacrifice . . . for Italy. . . . Poor Mazzini! After all he succeeded . . . Italy united, with Rome for her capital. . . . We wait to see whether Italy will make anything great out of what she has got.' Italy has now got not another Mazzini, but a Mussolini—the Prime Minister who has never been an exile, but has exiled thousands of his countrymen.

THE DISCIPLES' COMMENTARY.

Professor David Smith has completed his commentary on the New Testament by the issue of volumes iv. and v., which deal respectively with Acts to Second Corinthians and Galatians to

Revelation. It is a great task, calling for unusual courage and learning, for so wide is the field of Biblical learning to-day that none can hope for complete mastery in every department. As indicated by its title, *The Disciples' Commentary on the New Testament* (Hodder & Stoughton; 21s. net each), the work is homiletical rather than critical, and it cannot be doubted that the Church needs work of this sort. After the long reign of critical exegesis, it is time, as Karl Barth has urged, that we got past that to the kernel of the Biblical message. This has been Dr. Smith's aim throughout, and it need hardly be said he has attained the highest measure of success. He has his own opinions on critical questions, opinions which will not always command assent, but these are not obtruded. His work is intended for the edification of the general reader, and it will be found to fulfil this purpose to admiration. From his wide reading, and particularly from his full knowledge of the patristic writings, he has drawn many apt illustrations which with the lucidity of his style make his commentary most readable. At the same time it is characterized by that spirit of reverence which is a marked feature of all that Dr. Smith writes.

The late Mr. G. Lowes Dickinson writes with his usual felicity and ripeness of wisdom on *The Contribution of Ancient Greece to Modern Life* (Allen & Unwin; 2s. net)—his untimely death must have occurred almost on the date of publication. He deals first with Greek literature, then with Greek thought, and the dominating influence it has had in shaping the Western world. After showing how Greek thought turned away from natural science in the interest of ethics, he concludes by suggesting that the same problem faces us to-day. 'There has recurred, but now in a far more urgent form, the old dilemma of Græco-Roman society. How are we to deal with science? Shall we allow it to destroy us, or shall we destroy it to save ourselves? Neither way seems a good one; but is there not another alternative? There is, clearly, if we would but take it. Our science, we saw, is the product of the Greek spirit; but so is our ethics. In the Græco-Roman crisis these two movements fought one another, till ethics, in the end, destroyed science. What we have to do now is to reconcile the antagonists—to apply ethics to science and science to ethics. This movement, I think, has already begun, and on its success depends the future of civilization.'

The Cross moves East, by Mr. John S. Hoyland (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net), declares itself in the subtitle to be 'a study in the significance of Gandhi's "Satyagraha."' It is an intensely interesting and moving story. After a penetrating discussion of the meaning and influence of the Cross in New Testament experience and in Christian history, the writer goes on to describe the Indian spirit of devotion (*Bhakti*) and the development of Mahatma Gandhi's doctrine of Satyagraha, which, roughly, corresponds to Passive Resistance. He has many things to tell that the British public should know and deeply ponder. At the same time one cannot but feel that he writes in too uncritical a spirit and represents the Indian agitation as far more Christian than it really is.

Another volume about Russia. It is entitled *Red Russia*, by Theodor Seibert (Allen & Unwin; 15s. net). It is bound in red and has a red wrapper. The author, a practised journalist, spent four years in Russia as the representative of three important German newspapers, with the utmost freedom to write of his experiences. We are told that he travelled widely through Russia, and had no axe to grind, being neither socialist nor anti-socialist. He is satisfied that the strongest pillar of the Red World Movement is the mere fact that the Russian Soviet State exists. 'It is a peculiar fact that although in a free vote the immense majority of European workers would decide against the introduction of bolshevism into their own land, nevertheless a large majority would be opposed to any attempt in the way of foreign intervention to put an end to the bolshevik experiment in Russia.' The German working class, for example, whose opinions are at present conspicuously before the public of Europe and America, is inclined, he thinks, 'to regard the mere persistence of bolshevik régime from 1917 to 1932 as sufficient proof that socialism is a workable proposition.' Mr. Seibert says that again and again his German compatriots have said to him, 'If things in Soviet Russia were really so bad as some allege a counter revolution would have broken out long ere this. My answer is "If in Germany such things had been going on as have occurred for the last fourteen years in Russia, we should have had not one, but fourteen revolutions! For the rest the Russians have been suffering not for fourteen years, but for three centuries."' Mr. Seibert has a good deal to say about the attempt, and the expectation, of the revolutionaries to stamp out religious belief. They founded the Atheistic League which issues a weekly

journal well produced from the artistic and literary point of view. 'This periodical devotes itself, partly to making a mock of religion, and partly to the scientific refutation of religious and ecclesiastical doctrines.' The most potent weapon in the campaign against religion is the schools. 'It is no exaggeration to say that the main object of the Soviet schools is to bolshevise the Russian youth. A noteworthy fact, however, is that the Orthodox Church continues to flourish.'

Under the rather vague title *Flynn of the Inland*, by Mr. Ion L. Idriess (Angus & Robertson, Sydney; 6s. net), a writer well known in Australia, we have a simple yet most vivid narrative of 'the work which has been and is being done for isolated and suffering humanity by the Australian Inland Mission, its Padres and Doctors, its Sisters and voluntary workers—and by one Padre in particular,' John Flynn, whose resourceful work ensures for him a distinguished place in Australian history. It is only when we look at a map of the huge island continent of Australia that we get some idea of the extent to which its population is to be found along the seaboard. But we utterly fail to realize that vast interior country stretching away to the north and north-west, where handfuls of scattered people battle for their homes, sometimes for their lives or the lives of their wives and children, isolated in ones and twos, tens and twenties, hundreds of miles from medical, material, and spiritual aid. This is the story of how John Flynn, the Padre on camel-back of the Australian Inland Mission, did his utmost to help these isolated pioneers of civilization. The rail-head from Adelaide on the south coast reaches half-way into the interior, and now the motor-car has displaced the camel, and the steady effort of the Australian Inland Mission is to place its hostels and nurses and doctors within easier reach of the far-scattered population of whites. The story is most graphically told, and grips the interest of the reader from beginning to end.

An interesting study of *The Psychology of Methodism* has been written by the Rev. Sydney G. Dimond, M.A. (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net). The writer has already proved his competence in this field, and many who have read his larger work on 'The Psychology of the Methodist Revival' will welcome this shorter and more popular account. His aim is 'to give some account of Methodism from the point of view of psychology and philosophy.' In pursuit of this aim he deals with the religious

experiences of the Wesleys and Whitefield, and then treats of such themes as Conversion and Character, Crowd Psychology, Rhythm and Song, Ethics and Perfection. The whole exposition is warmly religious and full of real insight. A curious error occurs on the cover, where 'Wilberforce' is an obvious misprint for 'Whitefield.'

Why Jesus never wrote a Book, by the Rev. W. E. Sangster, B.A. (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net), is a series of popular sermons which aim above all things at being interesting and modern. In this the writer attains a great measure of success. The sermons are full of illustration and anecdote, the titles are fresh and suggestive, and there is not a dull page in the book. It is to be regretted that the preacher should quote as authentic some of the current depreciations of the religious heroes of the Victorian age. In particular he speaks of 'the furtive brandies and sodas of General Gordon,' a baseless slander which has been convincingly disproved, and was characterized by Lord Kitchener as 'a damned lie.'

It is thirty years ago since Dr. Dinsdale Young showed what an eye he had for 'Unfamiliar Texts.' In his most recent volume—*The Sanctity of Daily Life* (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net)—he gives evidence that his eye is as keen and his style as charming as ever. He discourses with inimitable wit and Christian wisdom on such themes as Expenses, Family Parties, Congratulations, Appointments, Saturdays, Mondays, Birthdays, and Calkers, finding for all of them appropriate texts which he makes to sparkle like gems of many facets. It is a book to delight the most un-theological reader.

Dr. Mingana continues his very valuable and highly expert work on Christian documents in Syriac and Arabic by the publication of the 'Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Nicene Creed,' as vol. v. of *Woodbrooke Studies* (Heffer; 21s. net). Theodore, like Origen, was both a scholar and a thinker: his views on the Old Testament are often astonishingly modern, while, as a theologian, he exercised an influence at once wide and profound, though, in view of his emphasis on the humanity of Jesus as against those who tended to ignore it, it is hardly surprising, though it is more than discreditable, that a hundred and twenty-five years after his death he was anathematized. His 'Commentary' on the Nicene Creed, dealing largely though not exclusively with Trinitarian and

Christological dogmas, is really a series of addresses, and is marked both by the vividness and the occasional repetition which are apt to characterize public discourses. The beautifully printed Syriac text is accompanied by a thoroughly idiomatic English translation, so that it makes a twofold appeal—to students of Syriac on the one hand, and to students of theology on the other; for here we have a commentary on one of the most important documents of the Christian Church by one of the most powerful thinkers of the golden age of Christianity.

The Goodly Fellowship, by Miss Phyllis L. Garlick (Highway Press; 2s. net), is a book full of warmth and colour. It is cast in an historic mould. The writer gives a rapid and picturesque survey of the brightest pages of Christian history. We have chapters on 'The Adventure of the Early Church,' 'Saints of the Western Isles,' 'Prophet Voices of the Middle Ages,' 'Spiritual Heroes of the Eighteenth Century,' and 'Prophets of an Open World.' The whole heart-stirring story is then made the basis of an appeal to the youth of the Church to face the Christian task of to-day and bring in the hour of universal brotherhood.

After Professor Benjamin B. Warfield's death in 1921 a small editorial committee undertook to publish in ten volumes his contribution to theological thought. This pious work they have pursued with praiseworthy consistency throughout these difficult post-war years. Volume nine is now issued under the title of *Studies in Theology* (Milford; 20s. net). It contains a reprint of twenty-one important articles. These deal with such subjects as Christian Supernaturalism, Atonement, Faith in its Psychological Aspects, Baptism, Annihilationism, and Mysticism. One of the longest is on Predestination in the Reformed Confessions in which a useful conspectus is given of the confessional teaching of the Reformed Churches. On the border line between science and religion we have two articles on the Antiquity and Unity of the Human Race, and on Charles Darwin's Religious Life. It is hardly necessary to characterize these articles, for it may surely be assumed that Professor Warfield is still remembered as an accurate scholar, a logical thinker, and a distinguished exponent of the evangelical doctrines of the Reformation. It is well that his contribution to modern theological thought should be so worthily preserved.

The Reverend Walter Lock, D.D., sometime

Warden of Keble College, Canon of Christ Church and Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford, has collected some of his *Oxford Sermons* and published them under that title (Milford; 6s. net). He explains why he has done so: 'My life has been given to teaching, and I have a longing still to do this in the only form still possible to me.' It is a good reason, and in the sermons readers will find much teaching to give heed to. We have quoted one of the sermons in 'The Christian Year' this month in shortened form.

The Apostle John, by Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas (Pickering & Inglis; 4s. net), is very fitly described as 'a reverent and sympathetic study of the life of the disciple whom Jesus loved, with a series of expository and devotional outlines on the Gospel and the Epistles of John.' The writer leaves all critical questions out of account, and, taking the New Testament narrative just as he finds it, he proceeds to draw out the moral and spiritual lessons. Many may feel this somewhat unsatisfactory, but the book is packed full of first-rate homiletical matter. In dealing with the Apocalypse, Dr. Thomas is content to give a summary of the various methods of interpretation, adding some valuable suggestions of his own. His book is 'intended to help those who are called on to preach and teach,' and we have no hesitation about its eminent fitness to fulfil this intention.

Audi alteram partem is a wise counsel so long as the other part is given with fairness. This can hardly be said of a little book, *The Oxford Group Movement: Is it of God or Satan?* by Mr. J. G. Brown (Pickering & Inglis; 1s. net). The writer appears to be a very earnest Christian of a very narrow type, who cannot see any truth or goodness unless it is expressed in his own particular way. He undoubtedly puts his finger on some of the weaknesses and dangers of the Group Movement, but his criticism is entirely unsympathetic and fault-finding. His suggestion that Dr. Buchman and his associates are inspired by 'a seducing spirit posing as Christ' is not likely to be taken seriously. The book might make wholesome reading for members of the Group, but as an estimate of the Movement it cannot be commended.

It is surprising that *Things Seen in the Scottish Highlands* (Seeley, Service; 3s. 6d. net) should be one of the latest instead of one of the earliest of this notable series of beautifully illustrated guide-books.

It is at any rate appropriate to this new era in which the attractions of the homeland for tourists have already won greater popularity than has ever been known. The guide in this case is Mr. James Baikie, F.R.A.S., who gives his readers as graphic and attractive a description of all that is best worth seeing in the highlands and islands as he has given of the charm of the Scott country. The narrative is illustrated by a fine series of more than thirty photographs.

Attention should be drawn to an excellent collection of sermons from which a sermon was abridged for 'The Christian Year'—*The House of Pilgrimage*. The title is from 'Thy statutes have been my songs in the house of my pilgrimage,' and the volume contains twenty-six sermons preached in the Temple Church by the Reverend S. C. Carpenter, B.D., Master of the Temple. The publishers are the S.P.C.K. (6s. net). One of the sermons is of special interest for the first Sunday in November—it was preached on November 2nd, 1930, and had for its subject Richard Hooker, Master of the Temple, who died on November 2nd, 1600. Here is the account of his last day on earth: 'The next day, returning, the doctor [Dr. Saravia] found him "deep in contemplation, and not inclinable to discourse," which gave the doctor occasion to enquire his present thoughts: to which he replied that "he was meditating the number and nature of the angels, and their blessed obedience and order, without which peace could not be in heaven; and oh, that it might be so on earth!"'

The title of a little book of a hundred pages—*Corner of England* (Williams & Norgate; 4s. net)—suggests some specially interesting and notable rural district rather than a London slum overlapping the area of two boroughs, 'both of them notorious as centres of poverty and congestion.' Its author, Mr. John Martin, gives an intimate and interesting study of the varied population in this crowded corner of London south of the Thames, the result of his observation during the years that have followed the Great War. 'The Londoner is remarkably quick, especially with his tongue, shrewd, volatile, observant, humorous, sentimental, compassionate, gregarious, easily susceptible to pain, yet in ultimate things courageous as a lion.' One remarkable change in personal conduct is the gradual diminution of drunkenness. Even after the War it was a common thing to see a drunken man in the streets, especially on Saturday nights, with two or three fights to boot. This has all dis-

appeared. 'A man or woman is now ashamed of being frequently drunk in neighbourhoods where before the War such a thing would scarcely have been remarked.' The rather meagre details in the chapter on Religion, in which no mention is made of the work of the Salvation Army, suggest

that Mr. Martin cannot have made a very intimate study of the work of the churches. 'Nothing is better known about the industrial classes than that they are inveterately addicted to gambling. . . . With most people here gambling is in the blood, for many it is our chief relaxation.'

Christological Notes.

BY PRINCIPAL ALFRED E. GARVIE, M.A., D.D., NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

I. THE Reformation made the doctrine of justification by faith the crucial article of a falling or a standing Church. It will be now generally agreed that this is too narrow a basis, and we must lay a broader foundation for the theology which our day needs. In my judgment it is *the person and the work of Christ*, not in distinction or separation from one another, but in their necessary mutual implication, for the work as the expression of the person derives its significance and value from the person. His whole historical reality must be taken into account as Revealer of God and Redeemer of men. The three offices which the Protestant dogmatics recognized—prophet, priest, and king—need to be brought into a unity, as Ritschl brought them, but with one modification. He regarded the kingship of Christ as the unifying conception, the prophethood as the manward and the priesthood as the Godward aspect of that kingship. Christ established the kingdom of God by bringing God to men in the revelation of God, and drawing men to God by the redemption He effected. Holding as I do that the most adequate conception of the kingdom of God is that of His *present saving sovereign activity*, and that the primary organ of that activity was and is Christ, His kingship is this sovereign saving activity of God in and through Him; for therein and thereby God reveals Himself and redeems man.

(1) It is evident that as the organ of this activity of God, Jesus must be in so immediate and intimate relation to God that what He does God does in and by Him—the person must be Divine as is the work. Whole-heartedly do I hold the Nicene faith that God—no other and no less—was in Christ 'for us men and our salvation,' although my mind does not allow me to bind my appreciation of His Divine Person and Work to the philosophical categories of the Œcumenical Creeds. With the passage of the years this conviction grows clearer and firmer.

For me it would mean disaster to the Church were this Nicene faith to lose its authority over Christian thought; and, therefore, no duty seems more urgent than that a large measure of agreement should be reached in a modern Christology, which would state the abiding truth in the current modes of thought and speech of to-day. These notes are an attempt to remove misunderstandings, and to offer suggestions towards the fulfilment of that duty, and thus the presentation of that truth, so that it will again secure general acceptance.

(2) In this connexion there seem to be two dangers to be avoided—modernism and reaction—the Scylla and the Charybdis between which contemporary Christology should steer a steady and straight course. Modernism seems to me so to minimize the difference between God and man—using too glibly talk about the humanity of God and the divinity of man—that the distinctiveness of the person and the work of Christ is obscured, and He becomes only one instance of a general process. Or, on the contrary, when not tending towards pantheism, but inclining to deism, it so asserts the difference of God and man that Jesus is reduced to a wise and good man—the best of His race—who told men that God was Father, but did not as Son perfectly reflect that Fatherhood in His own relation to God. He is either Divine, as all men in some degree may be, or not Divine at all, since no man can be. In the reaction against modernism, of which in my judgment the Barthian school must be regarded as the most prominent and influential example, it is this difference of God from man—God the wholly Other—which is so emphasized, as to make it impossible to form a concrete conception of the historical personality of Jesus, as God under human conditions and limitations. There is an *Otherness* of God from man, so that it tends only to confusion to use of

God and man, terms obscuring the difference. But God is not altogether Other than man. There is a likeness of man to God, so that God can be the Father of all men, and each man may become a child of God. If we deny the difference of God and man, we deprive Christ of His unique significance and value; if we deny the affinity of God and man, an intelligible and credible conception of Him becomes impossible, and the mystery of His person becomes a monstrosity.

(3) The reason why the Creeds have not given us a satisfactory formulation of the truth about Christ is that they rest on a pre- and sub-Christian conception of God and man alike, exaggerating the difference and ignoring the affinity. The difference of the natures is so asserted, that the unity of the person remains a mere verbal abstraction. We must think of God as Jesus taught, as the seeking heavenly Father, and of man as He dealt with man, as the lost earthly child, if we are to understand in any measure how in the Son of Man it was God Himself who was seeking and saving the lost. He did not change the nature, character, or purpose of God as eternal holy love; but He did seek to change men's thoughts of God. Even in Christian theology that necessary change has not yet been completed, and an adequately Christian Christology is hindered because we have not yet an adequately Christian theology and anthropology. To give only one illustration in regard to the second, it is unhistorical dogmatism to talk about the fall of man, as if Gn 3 could still be treated as authentic history. The reality of sin—its universality, its persistence, its potency—need not be minimized, but the facts as to man's origin and development which modern knowledge yields us must have due weight given to them in our estimate of man as sinful and needing salvation. Sin has not so changed the nature of man as to make him less God's creation, and in promise and potency by the divine intention His child. What seems now to be needed is sobriety of temper, balance of judgment, and moderation of language in our doctrine of man.

(4) Because it is imperative that we should have Christ's conception of God and man, the fact of the Incarnation is so important for Christian thought. A man inspired to think and to speak of God as Father is an immeasurably less adequate and convincing revelation of God's Fatherhood than is an historical personality, who, under human conditions and limitations, knew Himself to be Son, as no man had ever known himself to be, and because of the certainty He had in Himself and His constant

relation to God could and did with confidence declare God as Father to men. It is He who, through His Sonship, has mediated God's Fatherhood to men; He Himself had not, and needed not, any Mediator. There was an immediacy in His relation to God as there is not for any to whom He had mediated God's Fatherhood. To minimize or to deny His uniqueness—and this word I use with as absolute a meaning as I can put into it—is not to give greater assurance of the universal Fatherhood of God; it is in my judgment to lessen the certainty. God as man can bring the reality of God into the thought and life of man, as no words of man about God can. A theologian is depriving himself of the grounds of his confidence in the truth of God's Fatherhood, if he by denying that Christ is God as man challenges Christ's own certainty as Son of God; for it seems to me at least His consciousness as Son was not an inference He drew from God's universal Fatherhood: it was because He knew Himself as Son that He revealed God as Father.

(5) Without attempting to deal in any detail with what may be called the metaphysics of the Person of Christ, as I have done this elsewhere,¹ there is just one consideration, which my recent studies have suggested, which seems to me to deserve mention. The conception of evolution, as represented by Herbert Spencer, is now superseded; the current conception is represented by such phrases as *creative*, or *Emergent Evolution*. It is recognized that at each stage of evolution something new is created or emerges, inexplicable by, although dependent on, the old. The possibilities of Bergson's *élan vital*, to which he has given a theistic reference, do not exclude such a creative personality as Jesus Christ. The evolution of Alexander's creative principle of Space-Time is always towards an ideal deity which never becomes actual. Is it not at least credible, and not unintelligible, that at one point the ideal deity became actual? Lloyd Morgan, whose philosophy is theistic as a necessary complement to his naturalistic science, expressly admits that the ideal may have become actual, if the historical evidence can be held to prove the fact. It is my conviction that a Christology such as I have tried elsewhere to formulate is not a flagrant contradiction, but an appropriate completion of the realist-idealist philosophy to which some thinkers to-day are tending as a theistic interpretation of the current conception of *Emergent*

¹ I may refer the reader who has interest enough to desire to know my views more fully to my volume, *The Christian Doctrine of the Godhead*.

Evolution. To avoid misunderstanding, let it be made clear that Christ does not merely emerge as a significant and valuable variation in evolution. Each emergent is created; not a personified process, but the personal God alone is the explanation of this final emergent: 'in the fulness of the time God sent his Son' (Gal 4⁴).

II. As Christology is the interpretation of an historical personality, it cannot be only a speculation, based on conceptions of God and of man and of their mutual relation, but it must be consistent with the facts. There are some difficulties in the understanding of these facts, which may prove hindrances to the acceptance of a Christology. And in order to remove, or at least to attempt to remove these stumbling-blocks, I shall in the second part of this essay deal with some which I have encountered in recent reading.

(1) *The literary sources* must first claim attention. (a) While it may be necessary to deal more critically with the Synoptic evidence than I did in my book, *Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus*, I am sure that the general impression of the historical personality does not need any serious modification. The recent development of New Testament criticism—the *Formenlehre*—lends support to this conclusion. We are in the Gospels not dealing with individual opinions about the subject of the record, but with the witness of a community to what its corporate faith in Him had come to be. Post-Resurrection experience may have modified traditions of the earthly ministry; but the words and works of that ministry are not the total historical reality of Jesus Christ with which theology is concerned. The faith of the Church in Christ is also a fact about Christ to be taken into account. Where the thought is an advance beyond contemporary Judaism, is it not more probable that it is the Master's, greater as He was than any of His disciples? If there are Jewish elements not consistent with His distinctive teaching, may not the community (predominantly Jewish) rather than He who in other respects rose above His environment be responsible for them? If He was great enough to evoke a faith which, challenged by the fact of the Crucifixion, triumphed in the experience of the Resurrection, is a minimizing hypercriticism genuinely historical?

(b) As regards the Fourth Gospel, I must adhere to the position of my book, *The Beloved Disciple*, that the reminiscences blend with the reflections of an eye-witness in many passages, that there are editorial additions, metaphysical interpretation on the one hand, traditions of the Synoptic type on

the other, but that it is possible to use the Fourth Gospel as a secondary literary source, not to add new features to the historical representation of the Synoptics, but to illustrate and confirm features less prominent in the Synoptics. If we reject the Fourth Gospel altogether as an historical source, we shall hesitate about accepting the confession of Mt 11²⁵⁻²⁷ (= Lk 10^{21, 22}), as 'Johannine marble amid Synoptic bricks.' But if the picture in the Fourth Gospel of the Son as knowing, trusting, loving, and obeying the Father commends itself to us as historical, then this passage will be credible as an authentic tradition. I should not feel justified in basing on the Johannine evidence a Christology which was inconsistent with the Synoptic testimony, but the Johannine representation makes explicit what is implicit in the general impression given by the Synoptics. A discriminating criticism is necessary, and no man who cares for truth will twist the facts to make them fit with dogmas; but regard for truth does not compel us to assume that Jesus was an ordinary Jew, with no secret of His personality to be disclosed in His words and works.

(2) *The limitation of the knowledge* of Jesus is sometimes advanced as an argument against allowing to His teaching the authority which is usually assigned to it. (a) That in matters of ordinary knowledge—facts with which science or history is concerned—Jesus shared the limitations of His surroundings is not disputed by any one who does not allow dogmatism to override evidence. When He Himself confesses His ignorance of the hour of His coming in glory (Mk 13³²), we need not be surprised if He ascribed the Psalms to David and the Law to Moses, in accord with the current language of His own time, or if He with others referred certain forms of disease to Satanic agency. I do not find it necessary to assume that He was accommodating Himself in these matters to the ignorance of His hearers. The Incarnation would have been only a semblance, had He possessed omniscience.

(b) Our Christology need not encounter any difficulty here, unless when His limitation of knowledge is used as the ground for denying the infallibility of His moral and religious insight concerning goodness and God. Such an argument seems to me, however, to betray ignorance in him who advances it. Knowledge and insight are not indistinguishable and inseparable. A learned man may be a fool. A man of little knowledge may be wise in the things of God. Knowledge depends on capacity to acquire and remember facts. Insight depends on sensitiveness of conscience and spiritual

receptiveness. Saints and seers have not always been scholars.

(c) It is as regards His eschatological teaching that it is most difficult to apply this distinction, for that teaching borrows much from Jewish thought which is, if not inconsistent with, yet divergent from His distinctive revelation of the Father, and has been discredited by the course of history. But some considerations may be offered to relieve the doubt. As the literature of the New Testament generally shows, the primitive community was, we might almost say, obsessed by the Jewish apocalyptic thought. Here more probably than anywhere, the tradition of the teaching of Jesus became coloured by the beliefs of the community. In so far as Jesus used this Jewish eschatology, He was using it as did the prophets of old; not with prosaic literalness, but with poetic freedom. How can the undetermined future be spoken of, unless imaginatively, in figures of speech? Even if He took any parts of it more literally than our historical knowledge allows us to do, that must be included in the ignorance which He Himself confessed regarding the future. It is only if the essential ideas of Apocalypse—God's activity in human history, His fulfilment of His purpose in the course of events, His judgment in and mercy towards men and nations, the coming of His kingdom in power and glory—are to be dismissed as false that Jesus' use of Apocalyptic for the practical ends of warning or encouragement can be regarded as evidence of the fallibility of His moral and religious judgment.

(3) That Jesus was in all points tempted as we are, yet without sin (He 4¹⁵), is a truth firmly held by many whose Christology, if logically carried out, would make temptation impossible, because of the practical assurance that for this reason He is able to succour those who are tempted (2¹⁸) and is compassionate towards them. With this lack of consistent thinking we need not now concern ourselves. The serious danger to Christology is the view that Jesus fell before temptation, and that had He not fallen, He would not, and could not, have been so gracious and pitiful to others.

(a) The assumption that temptation necessarily leads to sin strikes at the very roots of the moral consciousness. Sin would not be sin, were it inevitable. While there are temptations which are due to previous sinning, there are suggestions from without which have the character of temptation not in themselves, but because they offer the lower of two moral courses. The temptations of Jesus did not arise from any inward corruption

but from His vocation, in which the alternative was presented of fulfilling the popular expectations or of doing the will of God itself, of escaping suffering or accepting sacrifice. As regards the second consideration, it may be said confidently that while there is a Pharisaic righteousness, there is also a saintly goodness: the first shows no pity, the second is full of grace. It is he who has carried the battle through to victory who can best succour the tempted, and show compassion to their weakness.

(b) It is to be regretted that theology has given such prominence to this negative phrase, *the sinlessness of Jesus*, instead of dwelling rather on the positive fact of His moral perfection, for, if we adequately appreciate the whole content of His personality, we shall hesitate in pronouncing our fallible judgment on any minor detail of His conduct, which we do not fully understand. The height of His ideal, as exemplified in His life as well as His teaching, of purity of heart, goodness in the motives and dispositions, as well as words and deeds, the depth of His humility in His dependence on, and submission to, the Father, the breadth of His compassion towards all men, the length of His constancy amid trial and suffering in His vocation make Him, to complete the spatial metaphor, an instance of four-square excellence. Compare Him with so great a Christian as Paul, how He excels in His appreciation of the beauty of Nature, His interest even in the beasts and birds around Him, His valuation of childhood and womanhood.

(4) What appears to me hypercriticism in face of such a character has discovered flaws in His attitude to the Gentiles, His denunciation of the Pharisees, His acquiescence in the moral order with its rewards and punishments, His recognition of the will of God in judgment as well as in mercy. (a) The case of the Syrophenician woman is altogether inadequate counter-evidence to the universality of His grace, and His generous recognition of Gentile faith or Samaritan goodness. We do not know the whole story so as to justify a confident judgment. If we exercise an appreciative imagination, we can, reading between the lines, see in the words of Jesus an exposure of the Jewish prejudices of His disciples, who had probably remonstrated with Him for passing into a Gentile region, as in the parable of the Good Samaritan and in the commendation of the Samaritan leper He rebuked another prejudice. That the disciples should not seek earthly goods, nor limit their friendliness, as the Gentiles do (Mt 6³³, 5⁴⁷), is surely

a statement of fact and not a proof that He shared these prejudices.

(b) The disciples are required to excel the Pharisees (Mt 5²⁰) as well as the Gentiles. The Pharisees represented a perversion of religion and morals in their legalism, formalism, conceit, and censoriousness which was the antithesis of the filial piety towards God and fraternal practice towards men. Jesus taught that false principles and wrong practice were a hindrance to goodness and godliness. Their lovelessness to those who did not follow their ways, especially to the outcasts of Jewish society, was hateful to the compassionate heart of Jesus. His indignation seems to me no moral defect, but the inevitable reaction of the distinctive excellences of His character, of the distinctive deliverances of His conscience against what was most contrary. To be angry, if there be no personal resentment, is not sin; it is the expression of a nature enthusiastic for virtue, passionate in loving. To think otherwise is in my judgment to show defective moral discernment.

(c) There is a moral order of the world, in which we may discern the reaction of God to goodness, and against evil. To describe the beneficent consequences of virtue or the injurious consequences of vice as natural only is to personify Nature, and to interpose that abstraction between God and man in His dealings with man. To take isolated sayings of Jesus about non-retaliation as exhaustively indicating human duty and divine purpose in regard to sin, as some pacifists do, is to ignore the teaching of the succession of prophets, and the witness of the course of history. Even to represent God's redemptive activity in Christ as God's sole method of government of mankind is a partial understanding. Those who refuse grace are under law; those who reject mercy fall under judgment. That in calling men to receive the kingdom of God in repentance and faith Jesus warned of judgment and promised mercy shows no fall on His part below the Christian ideal. Jesus does speak of rewards and punishments; He recognized reality, and based His appeal on such reality because those to whom He spoke needed such an appeal. But if we look beneath the figurative language, the blessings He offers are not such as the selfish or the worldly would appreciate and desire. I see a danger to an ethically sound and strong theology in the prevailing pacifism, which knows only the tenderness, and not the terror of the Lord, which would dismiss such a phrase as 'the wrath of the Lamb' as a superstitious superstition. Redemption is, we may believe,

God's final purpose, which, we may dare to hope, will be ultimately fulfilled; but retribution—the reaction of His holy love against sin—has a place, even if it be subordinate, in God's dealings with men. To my conscience there is no offence in anything that Jesus taught about God's judgment, about the rewards of righteousness, or the penalties of sin. In His Cross He accepted, approved, and vindicated that moral order even in redeeming men.

(d) Those who reject the testimony of the Fourth Gospel cannot use the answer of Jesus to His mother at Cana (Jn 2⁴) as evidence of defect, nor His committal of her to the beloved disciple as an unnatural severance of His filial relations (19²⁶). If we accept the words on both occasions as authentic, we must not judge them in isolation, but as parts of the larger whole of His renunciation of the family relations, whenever and wherever these in any way conflicted with the absolute claims of God. A mother's influence must not control the use of the powers God had entrusted to Him. In this universal relation to mankind as Saviour and Lord His filial relation must be suspended. Theology has sometimes given a representation of the sinlessness of Jesus, to which we may apply Tennyson's words: 'Faultily faultless, icily regular, splendidly null.' What is often ignored is His emotional intensity in His submission to God and service and sacrifice for man; His rebuke, if such it was of His mother at Cana, or of Peter at Cæsarea Philippi (Mt 16²³), was not spoken in cold blood, but at white heat of feeling; and we dare not judge whether the words should or should not have been spoken, unless we can feel as He did.

(e) That there is no evidence in the Gospels that Jesus ever showed penitence, confessed sin, or craved pardon is an indication of sinlessness from the beginning even in His inward life, which to me is absolutely convincing, and any minimizing of its significance leaves me unmoved. His attitude to sinners of compassion, succour, judgment, forgiveness is inexplicable to me, had He had any sense of sharing that sin Himself. How could such insensibility be combined with the holy love His character in other respects displays? Over against this cumulative evidence, an obscure saying such as, 'Why callest thou me good? none is good save one, even God' (Mk 10¹⁸) cannot be understood as a confession of sin. May we not rather see in it a token of His humility towards God? While He was still being tempted, and under trial, while His baptism of sacrifice was not yet accomplished,

nor His vocation fulfilled, He would not claim equality with the perfection of God.

(f) Even if I could not find an explanation in instances of word or deed which presented moral or religious difficulty, I should not dare to set my judgment as infallible over against His as fallible. There is enough positive evidence of unique supreme excellence to inspire an adoration for His personality, which justifies the conviction that if there appear what seem defects (I do not believe that there do), He must have been misunderstood or

misreported. To sum up, the limitation of knowledge does not prejudice the infallibility of moral and religious judgment. The liability to temptation does not exclude the sinless perfection. There is neither word nor deed that compels us to lower the estimate of His person or work, which the faith of the Church throughout the centuries has enshrined—the faith which has proved that its hold is not on an illusion, but a reality, by its potency in saving and sanctifying men, and its promise of a humanity, redeemed from sin, and reconciled to God.

The Rationalization of Preaching.

BY THE REVEREND J. S. MACARTHUR, B.D., ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE, LLANDAFF.

By the rationalization of preaching is meant, not the intensification of the appeal to reason in sermons, but the application to the ministry of the Word of methods analogous to those which in industry go by the name of rationalization. These methods in industry may be briefly summarized as specialization of work, centralization of control, and consequent elimination of redundant effort. Just at present there is a far from negligible body of opinion, represented by such men as Dr. C. E. Raven, which favours the view that the effectiveness of the ministry of the Word would be increased by following a similar plan. In this way not only would the standard of preaching be raised, but much activity would be liberated for the service of the Church in other directions.

As matters stand, vast numbers of clergy with no special homiletic gifts or qualifications have to preach, and preach frequently. The results of such preaching, it is urged, are not proportionate to the amount of labour expended on it, and the clergy who toil ineffectively at the production of less than second-rate sermons would fulfil their vocation better by devoting more care and time to pastoral work and to the spiritual direction of individual souls, work which in the end is more fruitful than even the best preaching. And the present age will not tolerate amateur preaching. Accustomed as it is to the workmanlike and finished products of rationalized industry, it demands a similar standard of technique in the pulpit. This demand is already to some extent being met by the wireless transmission of sermons and religious addresses, for which

it is claimed that they attain so high a level as to make the average listener more than critical and less than receptive of what he hears when he goes to church. Hitherto the clergy, with the exception of such as are favourites of the microphone, have been disposed to turn a cold eye on broadcast preaching, regarding it as a rival to the regular ministry of the Word.

Would it not then be better to abandon the attitude of suspicion and frankly accept this new kind of preaching, this rationalized preaching, as a potent and valuable ally? The faithful would still assemble themselves together for worship, they would still receive the sacramental and pastoral ministrations of their clergy, but the sermon would proceed from a loud-speaker or even from a gramophone.

Along with this there might go a less drastic rationalization, effected by the selection of specially gifted and trained men who would constitute a preaching order in which their capabilities would find free scope, unhindered by the claims of pastoral or administrative work. Such a policy as this would not be conforming to the fashion of this world, but rather attempting to remove the reproach that the children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light.

Yet plausible though the scheme sounds, it gives rise to serious doubts. In the first place, it is possible to question whether the rationalization of industry has been such a proved success as to commend analogous methods to the Church. There are two factors which impede the smooth working

of industrial rationalization—the first being the effect that it has on the workers or producers, the second being the fact that while it may be possible to rationalize production, that is of little use without a corresponding rationalization of consumption which is not so easily managed.

It is worth while considering carefully whether there might not be something in the suggested rationalization of preaching corresponding to these two unfavourable factors which have so modified the success of industrial rationalization. Let us examine the position of the 'rationalized' preacher himself who corresponds to the 'rationalized' producer or worker in industry. The standardization of rationalized industry tends to make it more difficult for the worker to find anything like full expression for his personality in his work, and in rationalized preaching there may well be a similar problem. Mass-production—in the industrial sense—will not indeed have to be reckoned with, but there will be standardization with its attendant dangers. For example, the B.B.C. exercises a certain degree of censorship over broadcast preaching. Doubtless there are good, if not conclusive, reasons for the censorship, and those preachers who submit to it could justify themselves by appealing to the apostolic injunction to consider what is expedient, and to the apostolic example of being all things to all men in order to win some. But the submission to censorship is only justifiable so long as broadcast preaching remains a mere camp-follower of the Church Militant. If it is to attain to the rank of a major ally of the Apostolate, such a binding of the Word of God becomes intolerable.

This difficulty would be less serious, though not altogether negligible, for those specialists who would constitute the preaching order, but they would be confronted with other dangers. Some of the disadvantages of an itinerant prophetic ministry were noted as long ago as the age that produced the *Didaché*. To preach to those for whom a man has no pastoral responsibility is indeed a hard thing and invites the worst homiletic vices of sensationalism and insincerity. There is the almost inevitable temptation to the preacher to measure his effectiveness by the size and attentiveness of his audiences, by the demand for his services, by the attitude of the press, and so on. The other and severer tests which the pastor-preacher can apply when tempted in this way are scarcely available for the specialist preacher.

This is but one aspect of the consequences of the dissociation of the ministry of the Word from pastoral work. From the point of view of the

consumer or listener the prospect is no more reassuring. The sense of responsibility which is so apt to be lacking in the specialist preacher is no more likely to be found in his audience. It would not be easy to improve upon the diagnosis of this danger made by a specialist preacher of the old dispensation:

'The children of thy people talk of thee by the walls and in the doors of the houses, and speak one to another, every one to his brother, saying, Come, I pray you, and hear what is the word that cometh forth from the LORD. . . . And, lo, thou art unto them as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice, and can play well on an instrument: for they hear thy words, but they do them not.'¹

Another difficulty has been noted by the Dean of St. Paul's in his comparison of the efforts of the preacher to those of a man trying to fill a row of standing pitchers by dashing a bucket of water at them. But striking though the illustration is, it is very misleading in its assumption that the preacher treats his hearers as passive receptacles, though that is a fatally easy thing for the specialist preacher without pastoral responsibility to do.

Only like souls I see the folk thereunder,

Bound who should conquer, slaves who should be kings.

That is the preacher's ideal, a hard one indeed, but more readily attainable by the preacher who is in pastoral contact with his flock.

A neat readjustment of the Dean's illustration is beyond the power of the present writer, but it would be less misleading if the row of standing pitchers could be envisaged as living things which, however little refreshment they may obtain from any single ministration of the Word, yet receive an indication of where they may turn for more. It may be true that much more is accomplished by the direction of individual souls than by preaching to men and women in the mass, and it is undoubtedly true that there are many in the ministry of the Church whose gifts lie in this direction rather than in preaching, but it is questionable whether those gifts could be so effectively exercised by them if they did not preach sometimes. Private spiritual direction is no easy task, and the attempted rationalization of it in the obligatory use of the confessional does not commend itself universally. But what those who reject this Roman rationalization do not always see is that the rejection of it means that

¹ Ezk 33³⁰⁻³² (R.V.).

the succour and direction of individual souls must stand in a vital relation to the public ministry of the Word. There is a place, possibly a larger one than has been yet realized by the Church, for men with special training in psychology and moral theology, experts in spiritual direction; but the bulk of this work has to be done by the man who combines the functions of pastor and preacher. And these functions react on each other. It is in his pastoral work as well as in his study that the preacher finds his sermons, and in his preaching that the pastor prepares the ground for the more intensive work of spiritual direction. This last is a point that is often overlooked. Spiritual direction is not lightly sought even by those who stand in greatest need of it, and it is very largely from the way in which a man ministers the Word from the pulpit that he draws or repels his people as a spiritual counsellor. In this the priest whose gifts are pastoral rather than homiletic need feel at no disadvantage, for what counts is not the rhetorical brilliance that will draw crowds, but the sincerity and thoroughness that speak to the heart and will. Teaching Christianity to the young, and proving its truth to the old, said Fr. Benson, are very different things from winning hearts to Christ. There are short and easy methods for the one, but the other

can only be done by lengthened prayer and fasting. 'For their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth.' So in a better sense than a merely physical one there will be a virtue, a power of the Holy Ghost going forth from us.¹

Here there is possible a legitimate rationalization of preaching. The false antithesis between preaching and pastoral work must be set aside, and then the members of it, being recognized as complementary and not antithetical, will each enrich and stimulate the other. The method is neither an easy nor a short one, but the priest who applies it will no longer find himself saying that his pastoral duties allow him no time for the preparation of sermons, for how can a man face his people in their homes or give them spiritual direction when he has stood before them in the pulpit with an unmediated message or some one else's sermon?

'Will this sermon do?' said an ordinand to the Principal of his theological college, and received the reply, 'Do what?' The application of this test is the first step in the effective rationalization of preaching. The taking of it is not likely to introduce more loud-speakers, though it may mean the preaching of fewer sermons.

¹ *Further Letters of Richard Meux Benson*, 96.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Do you live up to your Name?

BY THE REVEREND WILLIAM S. TERRY,
SUTTON-ON-HULL, HULL.

'Thou hast a name . . . '—Rev 3¹.

I WANT you to come with me on a visit to one of the ships of the Royal Navy. We will go down to the Dockyard. Here she is in dry dock undergoing a thorough overhaul after a long cruise in foreign waters. We will go on board by the after gangway. There is a host of wonderful things to see; but here, right before us, is the object I want you to notice just now. It is a massive wooden scroll, carved in the finest wood, and the inscription upon it is written in letters of gold. Let us draw near and examine the inscription. We read 'Armada 1588,' then underneath it 'Copenhagen 1801,' then 'Trafalgar 1805,' and so on,

down to the engagements of the Great War. You will wonder what this scroll means and why it occupies such a place of honour. I will tell you. It is the ship's Roll of Honour. Of course this ship has not been in all the engagements mentioned on the Roll, for many of them happened long before this ship was built. But they have a very happy custom in the Navy of handing down a great name from one ship to another, so that there are names in use to-day that have been in use for hundreds of years. These names, then, are the sea-battles in which ships bearing this same name have taken part.

Now you can see the idea of the Roll. The men of this ship have entered into a noble heritage. Great associations have gathered around the name they carry, and they must live up to the name and the traditions of the past. When I look at this Roll of Honour I am reminded of wonderful words written long ago. A Christian leader was writing

to his friends. They had passed through a difficult time and there were more difficult days before them. He was just afraid that in the hour of trial they might fail. So he wrote a letter to them in which he told them of the great men of their race who had stood valiantly for truth and right. They were a noble army of men and women, and the record of their deeds would make their hearts beat with pride. 'Now,' says this writer, 'I want you to remember that all these heroes of the past are looking at you from the ramparts of heaven. They have run their race and won the prize; in your hour of trial I want you to be worthy of them. Look to Jesus, He will help you to be worthy.' 'Wherefore'—these are his words—'seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses . . . let us run with patience the race that is set before us.' You can look this story up for yourselves. You will find it in the eleventh and twelfth chapters of Hebrews.

But I want to tell you a little more about these Rolls of Honour. During the Great War there were so many ships in commission that many new names had to be used which had no great tradition behind them. So, in place of a Roll of Honour, many of them placed inspiring mottoes on their quarter-decks. In letters of gold they wrote such words as 'For God and the King,' or 'For Home and England.' But the strangest I ever saw was also the shortest. It was on a destroyer and consisted simply of two words, 'We Are.' Several times I passed that ship in the Dockyard before I realized its meaning, then I saw the name of the ship. What do you think it was? Its name was *Ready*. Don't you think that was a splendid idea? What better reminder could they have that they must live up to their name? Their name was '*Ready*' and they declared to themselves and all the world, '*We are ready.*'

I wonder if we all live up to the names we bear? Perhaps you are a Scout. Do you live up to your name? Are you prepared? Do you faithfully fulfil the Scout Law? How proud you were when your school badge first adorned your cap or blazer! Do you always remember that the honour of your school is in your keeping? Do you live up to the good name of your school, for it is a name you bear? Many years ago there were some people who were always kind to one another, generous to those who opposed them, always happy and ever seeking to do good. They said they were like this because they loved Jesus and were trying to follow Him. So they called them Christians. We bear that same wonderful name. Let us try to live up to it.

No Answer required.

BY THE REVEREND FRANK J. GOULD, WATFORD.

'Be ye separate.'—2 Co 6¹⁷.

I suppose you know what a quarrel is? It is a nasty little affair that looks harmless enough before it starts, but is always very ugly before it ends. Not long ago, in one of our northern towns, the electric supply suddenly failed. Out went the lamps, down slowed all the machinery, and the whole area was covered with darkness and idleness. You never would have guessed the reason, and it puzzled the engineers for a time. They knew well enough that somewhere a 'short' had occurred, that is, somewhere the two kinds of electricity, negative and positive, had jumped together. And when that happens, except in the right places, all sorts of mischief follow. Well, the engineers examined the machines, the fuse boxes, the wires. But they found nothing to account for the breakdown, and when they had repaired the damage, once again the lights sprang up and the machines began to hum. There was nothing wrong with the system. What, then, had caused the failure? A curious discovery was made. Out in the open fields a couple of dead crows were found. They were lying right under the electric wires, and it was clear that the two crows had been killed by the electric current. What had happened was this. The two crows had settled down on the electric wires for a rest. One of them perching on the negative wire and the other on the positive wire. Of course, as long as they kept to their own wire nothing happened, because the electric current just ran quietly and harmlessly through their bodies. But they didn't remain quiet. Some difference of opinion arose between them. You know how it is when you feel in a quarrelsome mood, anything will give you a start to a quarrel, and I suppose that is how the crows felt. One of them started quite innocently, 'This 'ere 'lectricity's no good.'

'Oh, isn't it?'

'No, not a bit! My mother's old black feathers are more use.'

'Go on with you, this 'lectricity lights the town and cooks the dinners.'

'Cooks the dinners! I like that. Why there's no heat at all in these wires; they couldn't warm a baby crow's cold toes?'

'Oh, couldn't they?'

'No, they couldn't?'

'Then they could!'

'Then they couldn't!'

And so the dispute grew hot and strong, until at last the crows got so angry that they wanted to peck each other, and leaning over they both cried out together 'You take that!' Their beaks banged sharply together, and that was the end of them, for the positive and negative currents now flew together through their joined beaks and both the foolish birds fell down dead. In addition the fuse box fired, the current was cut off, and all the darkness and idleness followed that I have told you about.

You see, the electric current could do the crows no harm as long as they kept apart, it was when they pecked at each other that the trouble began. It was just like that nasty little affair you had with Bob the other day. Certainly, he was rude to you, but if you had just kept quiet and hadn't been rude to him, he would have cooled down, and the quarrel would never have happened. Bad tempers do no harm, or very little, until they meet, but as sure as two boys, each with a bad temper, meet, then look out! It is the same with temptation. Temptation does no harm until we join up with it. It is when temptation and the boy unite that mischief comes. Jesus once said, 'The prince of this world (*i.e.* Satan) cometh, and hath nothing in me.' No answer from Me, no contact, you see. The positive and the negative currents couldn't meet. That was the secret of our Lord's sinless life, and that seems to me to be the true secret of every happy and helpful life. Don't join up with temptation, or bad temper, or meanness, or rudeness. Leave them to themselves. They can't hurt you until you yourself give them the chance.

The Christian Year.

TWENTY-FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Things that are excellent.

'That ye may approve the things that are excellent.'
—Ph 1¹⁰ (R.V.).

Such is St. Paul's prayer for those whom he loves, whom, as he has just said, he has in his heart; and it is a beautiful prayer, inspiring in substance and almost rhythmical in form—so much so indeed that a modern poet has taken it for the title and refrain of one of his poems. Here is one stanza in which he enumerates some at least of the things that are excellent:

The grace of friendship—mind and heart
Linked with their fellow heart and mind;
The gains of science, gifts of art;
The sense of oneness with our kind;

The thirst to know and understand,
A large and liberal discontent;
These are the goods in life's rich hand,
The things that are more excellent.

Instead of enumerating the things that are excellent, we shall consider some of the obstacles which are likely to hinder us from approving them.

They may be summed up in two proverbs: 'The good is the enemy of the best,' and 'The best is the enemy of the good.'

1. *The good is the enemy of the best.*—This is the obstacle which St. Paul had to meet. He had himself seen the excellency of the knowledge of Jesus Christ, but when he tried to make his fellow-countrymen see it, how difficult it was! They were so sure of the goodness and of the Divine character of the revelation that they had already: had they not the adoption, the glory, the covenants, the law, the great promises, the fathers, the Christ after the flesh? What more could there be? They were so proud of the glory which shone on the face of Moses, that they were blind to the glory on the face of Christ, and St. Paul had to remind them that what was made glorious was not glorious when compared with the glory that excelleth (2 Co 3¹⁰). They seemed to him like people who were so charmed with the glory of the moon and the glory of the stars that they were blind to any greater glory in the sun.

We ourselves are faced with the same danger in two different respects.

There can be no doubt that the outstanding factor of our time is that we have come to realize, as never before, how closely linked every part of the world is to every other, how absolutely one all mankind is, what a task it is to gather together into one the children of God that are scattered abroad. This is partly due to the War, which showed that all continents were affected by and drawn into a conflict between two European nations; but it is mainly the effect of the marvellous discoveries of science, which have made it possible for words spoken in an English pulpit to reach India or America as quickly as they reach those present in the church.

Now in the light of this factor two visions have been granted us. The first is the vision of a reunited Catholic Church, of all Christians as members of one organized body, with a common worship in which all can unite, where there shall be no rivalry between group and group, but all shall co-operate in trying to make

the kingdoms of the world to be the kingdoms of Christ.

At the same time statesmen have seen the vision of a League of all the nations of the world, each recognizing the rights of every other, and all co-operating to make peace prevail throughout the world, to substitute reason for force.

Both, surely, visions of what is excellent, but in both we may be blinded to their excellence by the goodness of what we have. We owe so much to our own Church, that we may easily ignore other sides of the truth, and lose a true sense of proportion as to what is primary, what only secondary, what is essential to real unity, and what are the limits within which diversity can be permitted or even encouraged and welcomed, when, that is, we shall all feel ourselves so truly members of one another that, in Shelley's phrase, we shall find

difference sweet, where discord cannot be.

Nor is the danger less on the political side: we are so proud of our national characteristics, of our steady growth into an ordered freedom, of our high standard of law and justice, that we may easily regard England as the sole arbiter of what is right, and be slow to respect the rights of other nations, and to look out for the contributions which they have to make to a common humanity, slow to believe in an ideal of unity, which shall in this sphere also make

difference sweet, where discord cannot be.

2. *The best is the enemy of the good.*—Let us apply this to our religion.

We Christians are convinced that we have the best, that Christ's revelation of God's character is the highest possible, that it touches the deepest instincts of human nature, that it is capable of bringing blessing to all mankind. But that faith carries in itself the danger that we shall be blind to what there is of excellence in other religions, that we shall see no good in them, that we shall despise them and so hinder rather than help our missionary efforts.

To take one instance from China, from the sympathetic account of the chief Chinese religions by our Oxford Professor of Chinese. Here are a few points which stand out.

The central act of their religion is the worship of ancestors, the outcome of filial piety: surely a germ out of which might spring a very real and affectionate worship of the Father of all. The unit round which their daily life revolves is the family: what splendid Churchmen they would make, when

once realizing the Church as the one human family. The virtue which ranks highest in Confucian teaching is sincerity, the very virtue which St. Paul treats as the result of approving the things that are excellent, 'that ye may be sincere and void of offence unto the day of Christ.' And what joyousness of worship finds utterance in this phrase from the prayer which the Emperor used to offer to the Supreme Being—'As swallows rejoicing in the spring, we praise Thine abundant love.'

We have indeed to widen, to deepen, to complete all these elements of truth by carrying to them the fullness that is in Christ, but meanwhile, as they are, we need to recognize, to respect, and in some ways to learn from them. It was a saying of George Herbert's, 'If a priest would be respected, he must respect,' and this is true of religions. If Christianity would be respected, it must respect all that deserves respect in other faiths.

Think what an example St. Paul himself set us in this matter: we need not look beyond the few chapters of this short Epistle to the Philippians to find many instances.

He was in prison and could no longer preach the gospel, but his friends brought him word of what was happening in Rome. There were many speaking the Word of God, some indeed doing it out of envy or strife, nay, actually wishing to add affliction to himself in his bonds! Yet he sees something which is excellent, and which he can approve, 'in every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is proclaimed; and therein I rejoice, yea, and will rejoice' (1¹⁸).

Again, he had counted all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus (3⁸). He was sure that God had given to Jesus the name that is above every name, that in that name every knee should bow and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord (2¹⁰), that in Him are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge hidden (Col 2³). Yet he seems afraid that his converts will be blind to excellence in the heathen world around them. How wide his appeal to them is! *Whatsoever* things are true, *whatsoever* things are honourable, *whatsoever* things are lovely, *whatsoever* things are of good report (or gracious), if there is *any* virtue (and he uses the common word of Greek moral philosophy), if there is *any* praise (such, for instance, as the city might bestow on a benefactor), think on these things, take account of them (4⁸). They all come from God, they all lead Christward, they are all worthy of respect.

Or once more in his own life, what discontent of anything short of the highest! how his heart is set

on excellence! 'I count not myself yet to have apprehended: but one thing I do, forgetting the things which are behind, and stretching forward to the things which are before, I press on toward the goal unto the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.'

Such, then, is St. Paul's precept and example. Prove, recognize, respect, approve, reverence all that is excellent. Let no pride in what is good in our privileges or in our life blind our eyes to what is best: let not the best make us despise anything that has any mark of excellence upon it, for all such has Christ's mark upon it and will lead us to understand yet more the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus.¹

TWENTY-SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

An Ideal and its Ground of Assurance.

BY THE REVEREND CANON D. S. GUY, B.D.,
GUILDFORD.

'The just shall live by his faithfulness. . . . The earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.'—Hab 2^a 14.

Here are two extremely arresting statements found among other striking ones, in a short book called after a practically unknown prophet, Habakkuk. Apparently he was a prophet of the Exile, and a contemporary of Jeremiah, and had literary gifts. This is all we can postulate about him personally. But his book will repay study, and he has left a decided mark in history. Moreover, the earlier of these two verses became one of the bedrock truths of Christianity and is quoted more than once by St. Paul (Ro 1⁷, Gal 3¹¹), who, however, used the Greek version, and wrote: 'The just shall live by his faith,' and based on it his teaching about the simple act of faith, by which the sinner becomes justified before God. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews quotes it also from the same version, though in his mind the words have the fuller meaning they had in Habakkuk's, viz. 'The just shall live by or in his faithfulness.'

If you read the earlier verses of Habakkuk, you will find that you are face to face with a prophet whose lot is cast in the midst of cruel tyranny and wrong, which he finds almost impossible to reconcile with his belief in God's love and goodness; with one who 'feels that revelation is baffled by experience, and that the facts of life bewilder a man who believes in the God whom earlier prophets have declared to Israel,' and who, though stunned

by 'the great disorder which God permits to fill the world,' yet refused to lower his ideal hopes for the world, or to abandon his faith in, and faithfulness towards, the God of his fathers. It is the old, ever-baffling problem of Sin and Evil, constituting a problem of exquisite pain to Habakkuk, yet not dislodging him from his position of confidence in the over-ruling providence of God.

In this second chapter—and there are only three—we see him, having launched his sad complaint and his passionate appeal to God, mounting his watch-tower, and listening for God's answer. That answer is that the vision Habakkuk waits for is a true vision, though it tarries. Therefore, he must wait patiently for it. In due time—which is God's time—it will arrive. 'Though it tarry, wait for it; because it will surely come, it will not delay.'

Meanwhile the just man will continue to live by his faith, his faithfulness, his constancy of reliance upon God and of co-operation with God. Faith in the Bible is not mere belief, but a venture made in alliance with God. It is 'the spirit of adventure consecrated to its highest end.' And what the vision, the ideal, the longed-for solution was, is told by v. 14:

'The earth shall be filled,' etc.

It is a grand thing in life to possess a great and lofty ideal or ideals; in other words, it is good advice to 'hitch your waggon to a star.' Nothing is sadder in life than to see young men and women renounce early ideals, and rest content to tolerate wrong and evil, which before they would have scorned and resisted.

That is a far-reaching admonition of Schiller's, 'Reverence the dreams of thy youth.' The halo which surrounds certain things in the eyes of the young should be carefully cherished. Young ideas, young hopes, young confidences, young reverence for great men, young enthusiasms over favourite books, all these are precious heirlooms. It is a costly moment when any one pawns his youthful reverence for woman, or for his own sacred personality, and its only proper fulfilment in dedicating body, soul, and spirit to God and to His service.

Emerson said, 'When you shall say, "I renounce—I am sorry for my early visions," then dies the man in you.' So Habakkuk's glorious ideal that—'the earth shall be filled,' etc., sustained him even when things looked blackest, and he sustained his hopes by patient loyalty to God. As we know well, Habakkuk was not destined to see the fulfilment of the vision so ardently cherished, but his very faithfulness to it helped to bring it about;

¹ Walter Lock, *Oxford Sermons*, 34a

and the New Testament, which does tell of its accomplishment, is bound up with Habakkuk's record and words.

There we see Someone in the line of succession to Habakkuk taking His stand on the same faith in God, and not only declaring that the time has come for the vision to be fulfilled—the vision Habakkuk was bidden to wait for—but also in His own person fulfilling Habakkuk's ideal.

And it is interesting in the case of Jesus to recall how, as a boy, He had entertained the same inspiring ideal as Habakkuk, and had never subsequently renounced the dreams of His youth. His earliest recorded words, when only twelve years old, announce His devotion to the same ideal. Then later, when grown to full manhood, we watch Him in the Gospels working hard to accomplish it. 'My Father worketh hitherto, and I work,' and this was what they were working at, the fulfilment of Habakkuk's vision.

And because He Himself was Man, and had come to set up His Father's Kingdom among men, He had to associate with Him other men in His emprise. Early in the Gospels we find Him doing this. He sees certain fishermen. He will detach them from their present calling, to attach them to Himself and to a higher one. Instead of labouring to fill men's mouths, they shall henceforth labour for men's souls. Instead of toiling to fill their nets and their pockets, they shall be engaged in filling God's Kingdom. So He bids them to a nobler toil, a more stirring adventure, and worthier ambitions, with promise of infinitely more satisfying results: 'Come ye after me, and I will make you fishers of men.'

And the way He trained and fitted these men for their new vocation was by imbuing them with His ideal, or, since He Himself embodied His ideal, by bringing to bear the impact of His sacred personality upon them, till they gradually looked through His eyes, desired His desires, and laboured for His ideals.

We see the importance of having noble ideals. Thank God, He has given us a clear standard by which to judge them. Every one of us can measure our hopes and ideals by those of Jesus Christ. If we feel He would share our wishes, approve our choice, co-operate in our aims, then we may be sure the ideal is high and holy. If not, it is no ideal or hope for a Christian man or woman.

To His Church, and to us as members of it, is committed the task of carrying to a successful completion the work to which He summoned those early disciples. Some of us will be familiar

with the suggestive parable or allegory of the conversation between Jesus and the Archangel Gabriel after the Ascension. Gabriel is looking with awe at the wounds in the hands and feet of the Ascended Lord, and says: 'Master, you have suffered.' Jesus answers, 'Yes, Gabriel, I have suffered.' Gabriel continues, 'And, Master, you have died.' 'Yes, Gabriel, I have died.' 'But, Master,' replied Gabriel, 'what have you done to secure that the cause for which you have suffered and died shall prosper and be brought to a final issue?' Jesus says, 'I have instructed Peter, and John, and James, and others, and told them to carry it forward, and tell others about it, that they in their turn may spread it yet wider.' Then, after a pause, Gabriel, who is not so confident about men's trustworthiness, says, 'But, Master, suppose they do not do it. Suppose Peter denies you again; suppose the love of John and James waxes faint; and suppose others of your disciples forsake you as before, what then?' '*Nothing then, Gabriel, I am trusting them.*'

Surely those words should sound in our ears. Is it to be wondered at that the religion of One whose whole life was one of faith in God, or who was so marvellously ready to trust His few chosen disciples, should express one of its basic truths in the short statement, 'The just shall live by faith'? On the other hand, what a pathetic thing it is to prove disloyal to a trust! Jesus looks to you and me to be fishers of men, to be extending His Kingdom, to be fulfilling Habakkuk's ideal, that 'The earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.'

Is that not something which makes life worth living? Is not that a higher aim than wealth or power or pleasure?

To help to fill the earth with the knowledge of the glory of God, and to do it chiefly by living a consistent Christian life, for Christianity is a thing caught rather than taught, though it needs to be both—that is a high calling indeed. 'O Lord, by these things men live;' yes, it is by his faithfulness in these things that a man can live the life which alone is worthy to be called Life, the life of which the New Testament speaks when it says, 'The just shall live by faith.'

TWENTY-THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Tragic Failure.

'Sleep on now, and take your rest.'—Mt 26⁴⁶.

By precept and example the Bible seeks to impress upon us the great seriousness of life, and

points out the tragic possibility of failure and irreparable loss which is the underside of its privileges. Just as the lightship or the burning flare is placed in the vicinity of a wreck to warn navigators of the nearness of danger, that they may steer clear of it, so along the track of life which the Bible outlines with such saving clearness are placed many warning flares in the shape of lives which have somehow failed of the grace of God. If we rightly receive their warning, and seek to avoid the causes of their undoing, we shall be doing something at least to fulfil the implicates of that grace which comes to us by Jesus Christ, the grace which co-operates with every honest and sincere endeavour of ours unto certain victory.

One of the clearest and loudest warnings which reach us is that of the failure of the men who during His lifetime were closest to Christ in privileged intimacy. They, above all men, should have known the inwardness of His prophetic statements regarding His own end, and the imminence of the hour. And they, more than any others, ought to have been lifted above anything like failure at the time when He most needed them.

How truly human is Jesus in His longing for the watchful presence of those who have been awakened into responsive affection by His love. And how pathetic and tragic is it that in that hour, when all was darkest and hardest, He should be disappointed. In His loneliness and isolation, three times He came to the men to whom He had accorded the high honour of watching with Him, as though to refresh His heart by fellowship with them, and three times they failed Him.

What a failure! And what a heart-piercing rebuke! as in that hour of victory, which was so soon to look like utter defeat, He said to them, 'Sleep on now! The hour of your great opportunity and of my great need has gone, never to return.'

They have missed the golden chance of ministering to His need; and at the same time of acquiring a knowledge of Him which the future would never hold for them. For the future, however carefully guarded, never atones nor makes up for the neglect of past days. For all time these men are not what they would have been, had the hour found them ready and alert with the keenness of a warm love to their Lord.

In what did their failure really consist?

We do not find a mother going to sleep when the doctor has told her that the sick child's life hangs by a thread. We do not find the anxious watcher, to whom the flicker of a loved one's eyelid is

significant, going to sleep. Love breeds a vigilant anxiety. Affection's head always wears an uneasy crown. These men failed because their love was not keen enough to interpret Christ's words, and to recognize that their hour, like His, had come.

The history of most failures is the history of unrecognized and neglected opportunities. The disguise of the commonplace tests both our powers of perception and our readiness of action. The tragedy of many lives is that its truly high hours come and go without evoking any semblance of recognition on our part. In business, in politics, in friendship—indeed, in all the realms in which men live their lives, this tragedy is being frequently enacted. And to it is traceable how much of the world's sadness and unavailing regret? For instance, could anything be more pathetic than the case of one who has been awakened by the rude hand of death, to see how he has for ever lost the opportunity of repayment and response to a love which has enriched his life, but which he has always taken as a sheer matter of course?

There is hardly any experience so bitter as that of waking out of self-indulgent slumber to find that some supreme opportunity has been for ever lost. For conscience, with unerring instinct, invariably points out the secret cause of the costly absorption. We see, when it is too late, the real inwardness of the call of Christ and of the offer of privileged service which He made to our undiscerning and unready hearts.

We awaken to our loss, for Christ loves us too well to have it otherwise. We almost always come to know what might have been, had we but been wakeful and ready in our love to Him. The influence which our courageous word might have exerted; the young life which might have been rescued from unspeakable sin; the joy which our gift might have brought to some weary toiler; the soul which might have been saved had we but accepted the privilege extended to us—all life's 'might have beens' sooner or later come back to us, and unite in speaking our bitter condemnation—'Sleep on now, and take your rest.' We get to know, when it is too late, that Christ has been asking us to watch with Him, and that we have preferred our ease.

Of no other love but His can it be truly said that it 'surpasseth knowledge.' That is to say, that knowing all there is to know of a man's weakness and defection, He still trusts Him and believes in the possibility of a future brighter and better than the past has been. This alone explains the further invitation He extends to the awakened and shame-

faced band in the garden—'Rise, let us be going.' Here is the confidence of a great love. They have failed Him only an hour ago, but He refuses to regard that hour as their best. So He opens up the opportunity which shall restore to them their lost self-respect, and win them to confident and close following, in almost the same terms as He had used when they rose from the supper and went toward the garden of His sorrow and their shame. 'Rise, let us be going.' It is as though He says, 'You have failed here, and the opportunity you have lost will never recur. But I offer you another one.'¹

TWENTY-FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The World Drama.

'Simon, Simon, behold, Satan asked to have you, that he might sift you as wheat: but I made supplication for thee, that thy faith fail not: and do thou, when once thou hast turned again, stablish thy brethren.'—Lk 22^{31, 32} (R.V.).

Peter did not fall for lack of warning. More than once our Lord told him what would happen. But the warnings fell on absolutely deaf ears. The reason for Peter's neglect of these repeated warnings was twofold. First of all, he had complete confidence in his own courage. He was by nature a strong and forceful personality, and he honestly believed he could stand up to any menacing peril without flinching. And, secondly, he was so entirely and completely devoted to Jesus that the very idea of defection and cowardice seemed wildly and absurdly impossible. For his love for Jesus was, in very truth, the master-passion of Peter's life.

This passage contains our Lord's final warning to this impulsive but devoted disciple of His. It was spoken in the Upper Room on the night in which He was betrayed and after the Supper. Coming events had cast their shadow over the mind of Christ. And, perhaps, the deepest shadow of all was cast by the thought that there was treachery in the inner circle of the Apostolate amongst the men whom He had called His friends. 'Behold,' He had said, with a breaking heart, 'the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table.' He felt the Tempter was present in that quiet room. 'Simon, Simon,' said the Master, using the old name of His disciple's unregenerate days, 'behold, Satan asked to have you, that he might sift you as wheat.'

We shall best understand that phrase 'asked to

have you,' or, as the R.V. margin puts it, 'obtained you by asking,' by turning to the first chapter of Job, where Satan is represented as asking God's permission to put Job to the test. And so here he is represented as asking God's permission to put the Twelve to the proof, and he undertakes to prove that at bottom the best of His disciples is but a Judas at heart. 'Simon, Simon, behold, Satan asked to have you that he might sift you as wheat'—that he may prove you are not wheat at all, but worthless chaff. He asked for *all* the disciples. But chiefly did the Tempter concentrate his attack upon Peter, because he was the natural leader of the Twelve—the future leader of the Christian Church. If he could only make Peter his captive, he might bring Christ's work to naught.

But that is not the whole of the picture. If Jesus had said that Satan had asked to have Peter to sift him and had left it there, implying that Peter had only his own strength to rely upon in his fight against Satan, there could have been but one end to Peter's story. His life's barque would have sunk like lead in the stormy waters. But the picture is this. Satan on the one side tempting Peter, and on the other Jesus praying for him. That alters the case. There may be failure and defection and cowardly denial in front of him, but there cannot be irretrievable ruin. Temporary eclipse there might be, but not final failure. The plotting Satan is no match for the praying Christ. In forecasting the history of this disciple of His, Jesus sees beyond the failure recovery and restoration. 'Do thou, when once thou hast turned again, stablish thy brethren.'

There is always Satan seeking to have us. Sometimes he works upon our own evil natures. For it is a plain and undeniable fact that we are born with a certain bias to evil. The dice seem loaded against us from the start. This is not to deny that we are born with a certain original goodness too—a certain capacity for love and purity, a certain hunger for God. But the baser instincts are the more clamorous and imperious. It takes effort and struggle to be good. It takes no effort at all to be wicked. But we keep and win virtue only at the point of the sword. It may be that our fleshly lusts are so strong because they get so long a start over the aspirations of the soul. They assert themselves as soon almost as life begins, but it takes time before the soul awakes. Anyhow, there these baser instincts are, clamorous and insistent. And Satan seeks to have us by appealing to them. That is how he appeals to youth—he

¹ J. S. Holden, *Life's Flood-Tide*, 152.

attacks them through their physical appetites. And, in case after case, he gets them.

Sometimes he seeks to get men by seductions that appeal to them from without. Perhaps this is not really another method, but just another aspect of the same method. Our baser instincts might remain quiescent were they not excited and inflamed. On the other hand, seductions from without would cease to be dangerous were there no base instincts within to which they could appeal. It is just a case of the powder and the match. The inflammable stuff is there in all our natures, and the temptations of the world outside supply the match. Temptations to evil abound in these days. Never were the incitements to folly and sin more numerous and more shameless and more insistent than now. And much of our literature is poisonous, often clever and brilliant, but full of peril to the moral life.

And Satan works not only upon men's passions, he works also upon their fears. When he cannot wheedle and seduce men into evil, he bullies them into it. And it is none the less Satan that does it that he uses as his instruments companions in shop and office, and sometimes members of the same household. It was by playing on his fears that he got momentary hold of Peter. For fear he might be put in the dock side by side with Jesus, he denied that he even knew Him. And, for fear of the gibes and insults of foolish companions, men deny Him still.

Satan is amazingly busy in our world. There is no one immune from his wiles and his assaults. He desires to have us all that he may sift us as wheat. But what gives us hope is that we see not simply Satan desiring to have us, but we see also *Jesus praying for us*. If there is an evil and destructive power at work in our world, there is also a saving and redeeming power. This transfigures the entire prospect. Satan doesn't get it all his own way. Jesus Christ is also at work. He works by means of the sacred influence of the home. He works by means of Church and school. And sometimes He seems to dispense with means altogether, and to work directly on the human heart, as He did in the case of John Bunyan—when, as Bunyan was playing tip-cat on the Sunday, he seemed to hear a voice, and with the eyes of his understanding saw the Lord Jesus looking down upon him with displeasure. In all kinds of ways Jesus pleads with men, and by means of holy memories and the warnings of conscience comes between them and Satan's temptations. From one point of view, it is fatally easy for men to fall.

And yet, from another point of view, it is difficult for a man to get past the seeking love of Christ. Satan desires to have us, but the mighty Son of God is making supplication for us.

What is true of the individual man is true also of the *corporate life of the world*. Satan desires to have it. The evil power seeks assiduously to gain control. He does it by stirring up suspicion and ill-will between the various classes within a nation, and by sowing seeds of discord and strife between the nations of the world. Consider the state of things within our own borders—how again and again we are cursed by industrial strife, how suspicion and ill-will between employer and employed threaten to bring this land of ours to the dust. And consider the state of things on the international stage. Greed, selfishness, and aggressive ambition are sowing seeds of discord amongst the nations. Militarists still preach their exploded doctrine that the best way to secure peace is to prepare for war. Europe seethes with the restlessness of fear. And all nations seem to be busy building partition walls against one another, and every such wall is a further cause of irritation and friction and possible strife. The world's sky is black with menacing clouds. As we think of the sinister forces at work we should despair of this world if we could see nothing but scheming diplomats, and militarists ever plotting for larger armaments, and chemists in secret preparing deadly gases—if we could see nothing but the jealousies and suspicions which exist between the nations.

But we see something else. We see Jesus making supplication for this perverse and wayward world which yet He loved so well as to die for it. If the Devil is active seeking to destroy it, Jesus is active seeking to save it. He is working through every peacemaker who tries to foster the spirit of mutual goodwill and trust; He is working through the League of Nations, which seeks to substitute law and reason for the ordeal of battle; He is working through His Church, ever proclaiming the great truth of the Fatherhood of God. And in many another way unseen of us He works upon the minds and consciences of men. *Jesus is making supplication for us*. And it is the realization of that that keeps us from despair.

And we cherish the same great hope for our world. We do not close our eyes to the evil influences that are at work, nor do we shut our ears to the sounds of dissension and strife. But we refuse to believe that the world is rushing to destruction. The power of evil is limited, the ultimate triumph rests with God.¹

¹ J. D. Jones, *The Inevitable Christ*, 125.

ARMISTICE SUNDAY.

The Unknown Grave and the Unknown Soldier.

'So Moses the servant of the Lord died there in the land of Moab. . . . And he buried him in a valley in the land of Moab, over against Beth-peor : but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day.'—Dt 34^{5, 6}.

Here, in the text, is the unknown grave of the Known Great ; one of the foremost men of history, one of the outstanding figures of all human record : one of whom we know more than of any man of his time, both personally and by implication of his achievement. Emil Reich, the well-known Orientalist, said once, 'They are trying now to make us believe that Moses was a myth, that he is not an historical figure : but remember this—the great pivot of history is personality. Behind every great movement of the human race there stands a great man. Call him what you like, all history is a lie, unless behind the beginnings of the story of Israel, its development and amazing persistence on the basis of monotheism, there stands some immense personality like Moses.'

The text, then, speaks to us of the unknown grave of the Known Great man. But to-day we have become strangely familiar with a new portent—the known and almost venerated grave of the unknown *common* man. In an article in an American periodical on the 'Unknown Soldier,' the writer says : 'Within the span of not many months I have stood beside the graves of three "Unknown Soldiers"—one buried on the slopes of Arlington, in Washington, one who rests beneath the stone flags of Westminster Abbey, and one buried in the middle of the swirling traffic of the Place de l'Etoile, in Paris. Italy also has her *militi ignota*, and doubtless others lie in other lands, whose troops took part in the Great War. Even making all allowance for the laws of imitation and the herd spirit which govern so much of our life to-day, this widespread honouring of the unknown is a novel and remarkable phenomenon.'

Heretofore throughout history it has always been the great leader who has symbolized a cause, or a movement or an aspiration. In the century that has elapsed, between the placing of the body of Napoleon beneath the dome of the Invalides and the burying of the unknown *poilu* beneath the Arc de Triomphe, there has occurred one of the mightiest revolutions that man's thought has ever known. It has come, this honouring of the symbolic unknown dead, to be a cult. The first thing that a distinguished foreigner must do on visiting the countries of these canonized Unknown

is to go and place a wreath on the tomb, though the visitor himself may have nothing to do with the War, nor need the visit have the remotest connexion with anything military.

In literature also the common man has become the hero. Rarely now does a serious drama depict a protagonist who by any stretch of the imagination can be called a great character. In fiction we have abandoned 'Vanity Fair' to mingle with the drab and narrow inhabitants of 'Main Street.' Truly, there has been nothing like it in the history of the world before. History has kept its monuments, its dedications, its memorial odes for its Duke of Wellington, and its Nelsons and Drakes, its 'Adonais' for its Keats, its posthumous honours for its Miltons, its Shakespeares, its Lincolns, and its Gordons. Go to Rome and you will find ancient Israel commemorated and symbolized not in the mouldering stone of some helot recently delivered from the slavery of Egypt, but in the imperishable marble of Michel Angelo's 'Moses.' Go to Paris and you will find Napoleon the Great lying beneath the immense dome of the Invalides, as symbolical of the early nineteenth century : but the 'Unknown' lying beneath the Arc de Triomphe, as the symbol of the early twentieth century. Look at it how you will, it is a very striking and undoubtedly significant fact.

Men have died in battle before, and been praised and forgotten. But this man will never be forgotten, as long as Westminster Abbey endures. He is not himself : he is a multitude, literally, that no man can number. He is not merely a million British ; he is ten million *men*.

'It may yet be that the dead will save us *again*,' as a writer said at the dedication of the Cenotaph—to echo their cry, whatever politicians may do or may not do : 'This shall never happen again.' That is true. But that is not all the truth. Vitally important as that is, there are deeper things still.

There is more here than a hatred and repudiation of war. Death is familiar to us—so familiar that commonly we think very little about it. But this multitudinous death, this wiping out of a whole generation, has made us think, as never before, not only of the causes and uselessness of the holocaust itself, but of the significance of the generation that has gone. Has it gone ? What do we mean by gone ? Does it really matter ? What *is* a generation ? And a new sense of the worth of humanity—of the essential, intrinsic, inalienable worth of personality—is rising above that vast pyre and is duly symbolized in the

'Unknown Soldier.' It is a new and unique way of saying that the common soul has found itself.

Now materialism would never have made that discovery. War would never have revealed a spiritual value of such fundamental and revolutionary moment—though it has helped us to see it, and though the world has done it lip-service for generations. It is essentially and primarily—yes, primarily—a religious value; not a mere social change but a spiritual revolution. It is Christ who discovered the unknown soldier.

But this is not really a new thing: it is a very old thing: as old as the teaching of Christ. It is only a newly recognized thing. 'Christianity has not failed: it has never really been tried.' Always to get things right, we must get back to Jesus and the values of Jesus. Sometimes He is represented as a sort of Social Reformer extolling the virtues of the poor and championing the poor against the rich. Jesus held that it is difficult to be rich: but He never championed the poor against the rich. He championed the *man in himself*. Once the Pharisees brought a woman to Jesus and made their accusation against her, expecting to catch Him in a dilemma of the Law: hoping that if He championed her against the Law, by the Law they might condemn Him. To their confusion and her surprise, He did not mention the Law: He did not champion her against anything: He championed her to herself. 'I do not condemn you: I believe in you: go and begin again.' When Christ spoke to the woman of Samaria some of the deepest spiritual truths ever spoken to a human being, He was preparing the way for the Unknown Soldier in Westminster Abbey. Jesus never said, 'Blessed is poverty': He said, 'Blessed are ye poor, for yours is the kingdom of God.' No one surely is foolish enough to imagine that Jesus taught that every poor man is a good man. Clearly the meaning is that to be poor is to suffer less temptation to be influenced by spurious values, and to be in a position to see much more easily and clearly the new, essential values: that a man is 'worth' not what he possesses, but what he is, neither more nor less. And—this is the heart of it, that his worth as a man is enormous. 'There is joy in the presence of the angels of God over *one* sinner.' Such a thing was never heard in the world before Jesus: and would not even now be believed apart from Jesus. It is that and nothing less that makes the glory of the known grave of the Unknown.

One of the chief claims of Christianity, where it is really understood and given its opportunity, is that it lifts human personality to an entirely new

place in the thoughts and considerations of men. 'In a world, largely indifferent to children, Christ gave a new value to the child, that persists to this day.' He didn't pamper children. He just valued them. 'In an age which hated lepers and left them to rot, Christ stretched out His hand and touched them.' Hardly less to them than that their flesh was restored like the flesh of a little child was the amazing realization that He had found a value in them: and that the soul is the measure of the man. Christ touched the 'untouchables,' and they became men. He did not set class against class, because He recognized no distinction whatever in social values. The only differences He admitted were character or personality values. In Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free. The Jews crucified Jesus quite as much for *His new teaching about man* as for His new teaching about God.

Christianity opposes slavery, vice, opium, alcoholism, sweating, *not* because it is a repressive system, but because all these things threaten and debase and enfeeble *personality*: not because sin arouses the implacable wrath of God, but because it injures us. And there is a lack of riches which, as Christ saw, sets men free to think in terms of actual reality, just as there are riches and an extreme of poverty that prevent them from thinking and facing reality at all. For riches or poverty in themselves, Christ cared nothing. He was the enemy of both when either so fettered the mind and blinded the vision of a man as to prevent him realizing himself—and every other—as a son of God. There is a lot of loose talk about the brotherhood of man. There is only one sound and irrefutable basis for it—common sonship of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Jewish theology knows nothing, or very little, of the worth of the individual. Its unit is always the nation. Even the great promises of the Old Testament to individuals—as to Abraham and Jacob—are always promises about the nation. In opposing the Pharisees, Christ was always up against the exclusive preferential nation idea. 'We have Abraham to our father.' Christ told them that names counted for nothing with God: and that the only ultimate human value is personality. It was not a question of Publican against Pharisee, but 'this *man* went down to his house justified rather than the other man.'

'And the woman *left her waterpot*, and went back to the city, and said to the men, "Come, see a man who told me all things that ever I did"—that is, "one who knows me much better than I ever knew

myself, and has shown me things that I never dreamed about myself." He had given her a new value to herself, which was her unsuspected true value. Conversion is a reality. And it means many things, and the trouble about it is, that traditionally it has been made to mean only one narrow and conventional thing: but the basis of all that it means is this—our value to Christ.

'But that was a long time ago, and He is dead?' Then how do we explain this—that after knocking

at the doors of hearts and Churches for nearly two thousand years with His new values, only a few years ago He got into Westminster Abbey with one of the oldest and yet newest of His values. Every man, the Unknown: the Unknown crowned not with the tinsel glory of an adventitious and fading fame, but discovered at last and crowned at last with the inherent and inalienable immortality that belongs to all the sons of God.¹

¹ H. E. Brierley, *Life Indeed*, 175.

The Function of Religious Experience in Biblical Criticism.

BY THE REVEREND A. G. PAISLEY, M.A., B.A.(LOND.), EDINBURGH.

1. To one moving among the people with thought for their spiritual welfare, perhaps nothing is more impressive than the present tendency towards a fresh approach to Jesus Christ, manifested even in the most unexpected quarters. Time and again one comes across men to whom the expression of religious ideas and aspirations is not easy, breaking through the bonds of a long reticence to pay tribute, and add their quota, to this general tendency.

The same trend may be observed in the organized or semi-organized religious movements of the day. Whatever views one may hold concerning Barthianism, there can be no doubt that it is uttering a genuine and authentic call for a more definite expression of Christian truth. As Professor N. W. Porteous says, 'The Church to-day is suffering from the widespread neglect of theology, and Barth has done us the incalculable service of summoning us once more to the earnest consideration of the big central things of the Christian faith.'² In a different way and with a different emphasis, the ever-growing Oxford Group Movement, of which so prominent a feature is the pooling of the witness of its members concerning what Christ has done for them, is performing a similar service; while the renewed interest in the second birth, brought about by the insistent testimony of the twice-born, is a further indication of this same quest for Christ. Even the disruptive anti-God movement is a tribute to the importance of the challenge of Christ to the men of this generation.

The religious movements mentioned, and others

like them, appear to be attempts to examine Christian experience reflectively and to give it more definite expression than it now has. And behind these, it may reasonably be surmised, is just that body of nameless and inarticulate longings which are stirring the average lay mind of to-day. After all, the great need for theology which Professor Porteous so wisely stresses is real, simply because theology is the medium through which men give expression or assent to their reflectively assimilated experience of God in Christ. It is because the old theology, in some measure and in certain ways, ante-dates modern experience that the need is clamant for a re-statement of the faith once delivered to the saints.

One feature in all these movements is noteworthy. They are taking place within the Church itself. They are not schismatic or sectarian. Here again, we are convinced, is evidence of that solid background of inarticulate will towards Christ of which we have spoken. The widespread effort to achieve the external unifying of the Church of Christ in Protestant Christendom to-day is, rightly or wrongly, an endeavour to meet the needs of this temper, which is certainly no atmosphere in which mere sectarianism may thrive. Men to-day are a little tired of the analytical tendency of much of the religious thought of the immediate past, and are seeking more and more for a convincing synthesis of the claims of Christ which will afford them, in their whole being, relief from their present spiritual bewilderment.

To the Christian minister whose life is spent in

² THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xliii. 342.

the service of Christ and of the people for whom He died, the present situation is fraught with great promise but also affords matter for disquietude. With the eyes of men turning towards the Church as the interpreter of the mind of Christ to them, we are conscious of a new encouragement; but the disquietude invades us when we ask ourselves, 'Is the Church sufficiently sure of herself as a guide in these matters?' The question is not asked in criticism of the Church, but out of a profound sympathy with her in her present situation.

It is not only that never were her problems greater in magnitude or more complex in character than they are now, but, far more, that never before has she been called upon to undertake their solution with the eyes of so many upon her—eyes that speakingly reflect the wistful longing for her success in these deep matters, upon her handling of which may depend the security of their faith.

2. With one of these problems alone we are concerned, yet it is one which has deep and abiding significance for the welfare alike of Church and people. It is the question of the relations between the historical criticism of the Bible and Christian life and experience. However one may view the difficulty, there can be no doubt about its existence. In its essential nature it is part of that wider movement towards definiteness in religious witness of which we have spoken; a demand for a synthesis of the confused elements in criticism thrown up by the years of controversy.

At first sight the demand may seem excessive, since the problem is in the last resort insoluble. We can no more hope to produce a critical method which shall be final, than we can hope to drain the sea with a child's bucket. Yet, in reality, it is not excessive, for it is tempered by the good sense of the people, who are well aware of the extent of the sea and the limitations of the bucket. The demand made is merely that this aspect of life and culture shall not be divorced from its other aspects, but shall be adequately correlated to these, so that the life religious shall present at least the possibility of wholeness.

This demand is surely not unreasonable, and it is made with no unreasonable conditions. To the generality of men the existence of historical criticism of the Scriptures has made very little difference. Most people could subscribe freely to the statement of Dr. Moffatt, made in a remarkable lecture entitled *Bookless Religion*,¹ in which he says, 'The Church did not make the New Testament, any more than the New Testament made the Church. Behind

both lay the great redeeming facts and forces. These still operate, partly no doubt through the incomparable and searching witness of Scripture, but never aside from that wider human experience, in relation to God's Spirit, which may be termed the bookless religion of the average individual.' This same average individual has, in the main, conceded that the Scriptures should be interpreted 'with the understanding also.' The *existence* of historical criticism no longer fills him with alarm. It is rather the *nature* of some of that criticism which perplexes him. It is that he suspects that much of modern Scripture interpretation is not 'with the understanding also' but rather 'with the understanding merely'; in a word, that it is, in fact, made quite aside from and quite regardless of 'that wider human experience in relation to God's Spirit' of which Dr. Moffatt speaks.

What these people ask is not that historical criticism of the Scripture should cease. They are not even unduly concerned as to whether such criticism is radical or conservative, but they are vitally concerned as to whether such criticism is Christian or non-Christian. They see plainly, what others more skilled in these matters sometimes miss, that Biblical criticism, like other things, may be good or bad, that it may serve to illumine Christian experience or may merely darken counsel with regard to that experience. They know from their experience of criticism in other spheres that mere destruction is not enough, and they rightly expect that all criticism of the Scriptures should be, in Paul's great words, 'for edification' and for nothing else.

3. The task which thus confronts us is to bring historical criticism and its truth into relation with Christian experience and to present it in such manner as to enable the ordinary inquirer after Christ to give his assent to it and derive spiritual benefit from it. This task is not made easier by the confusion which reigns in the realm of critical results. Those who are familiar with Professor J. E. McFadyen's brilliant summing up of 'The Present State of Old Testament Criticism,' in *The People and the Book*, realize the gravity of the position there stated. And New Testament criticism is in a hardly less confused state. Yet the task is not hopeless, if we will but be courageous.

'This kaleidoscopic confusion,' writes Dr. McFadyen in the essay named, 'would seem to discredit the critical method; in reality it does nothing of the kind. The historico-critical method is the only method we have: what is needed is not less criticism but more—more penetrating and

¹ *Hibbert Journal*, October 1908.

above all more sympathetic.' This acute statement goes to the root of the confusion. It is not the method of criticism that is wrong. The confusion is due, in no small measure, to defective sympathy, which brings us back to the plain man's surmise that some criticism may very well be wrong in spirit. One ventures to think that the adjustment of the relations between Biblical criticism and religious experience may lie in a deep interpretation of the last phrase in the citation above.

Genuine sympathy, in dealing with the Bible, would go far to confirm men in their faith in a God who in the Scriptures revealed Himself, by little and little as men could bear the truth, as the great source and centre of redemptive power in Christ. As a contribution to the solution of our problem, we may look at three ways in which this sympathy may seek adequate expression.

4. Such a spirit of sympathy might find an initial outlet in the frank recognition that the Divine purpose of redemption is definitely ministered to by the Scripture writings. There can be no gainsaying the truth that for the Christian or potential Christian there is vital significance in the fact that Jesus Christ appeared in Israel and not in any other nation. Is it not true that Israel presented Christ with an environment which for moral and spiritual enlightenment was at that time unequalled? Is it not true that that enlightenment was the result of a long preparation? Is it not true that the literature of Israel reflects that preparation and that in it are garnered and guarded the rich treasures of the mind of God? Is it not true that, though 'we have this treasure in earthen vessels,' it is none the less treasure rich and abiding? Is it not true that the Bible of Israel was the Bible of Christ? Is it not true that, at bottom, one of the causes of His indictment by His enemies was that He broke away from the Old Testament the crust of traditions with which it was surrounded and let its light shine forth to focus upon Himself? Is it not true that, in the preaching of His gospel, His whole life bore witness to the truth of His statement, 'Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets. I am come not to destroy, but to fulfil'? To any candid reader of the Old Testament it is surely not necessary to equate prophecy with mere foretelling of the future, in order to see its great revelation pointing towards Christ. There is in history no greater example of the coincidence of race, milieu, and moment as ministering to the advent of genius than that which confronts us in the life of Christ. Surely, then, the literature

which played so important a part in the consummation of the Divine purpose, as seen in Christ Jesus, must command our sacred regard as we approach it.

Surely it is a needless narrowing of the connotation of terms—amounting almost to a misuse of language—to make the words 'critical' and 'devotional' mutually exclusive, as is so often done. No criticism that makes for edification can be entirely devoid of devotional element, and a sympathetic appreciation of the greatness of the Old Testament as the necessary precursor of the Perfect Revealer of God and Redeemer of man will enable us to bring forth treasures new and old, to the enriching of our own spirits and the confirming of the faith of others.

In like manner, the sympathetic study of the New Testament, in the light of its ultimate aim, as unfolding the implications of the self-revelation of Jesus in the actual experience of the writers, will enable us to find not only the profitable point of view for our own souls, but the supreme means of helping those who look to us for guidance. Without this sympathy with the general aim of the whole work, we shall inevitably miss our way, alike to the mind of Christ and the heart of man.

5. This spiritual attitude of sympathy to the Scriptures in their general aim is not of itself enough to bring about the adjustment of the relations of criticism to religious experience, yet without it the task is beyond us. Such an attitude points forward to the next road our sympathy must travel. After all, the Bible is not a book. It is a collection of books by various writers, many of whom, especially in the Old Testament, were not writing definitely to further the general purpose of the literature as preparing Israel for Christ or as witnessing for Him in general, but were seeking to direct men's minds to particular parts of God's eternal truth, which, in His mercy, He had vouchsafed to them, and for the recording of which their spiritual receptivity had made them fitting instruments. The contribution of each of these authors, to be appreciated at its true value, must not only be considered against the background of the whole literature but also by itself, with an understanding as deep as we may obtain of the writer's mind. There must be room for our sympathy to flow out, in no ungenerous measure, to these men.

It is just here, however, that historical criticism of the individual books of the Bible, especially of the Old Testament, becomes so difficult. The causes of difficulty are two in number. The first

is the paucity of data concerning the writers and their situations. The second is that in them, as always in such rare natures,

There is some concealed thing,
So each gazer limiting
He can see no more of merit
Than becomes his worth or spirit.

Yet much may be done in spite of these. A sympathetic approach will surely cause us to view the books as living literature, the record of life, and not as so much material for the exercise of critical ingenuity. Speaking of this aspect of sympathy in literature, that acute critic, Professor Walter Raleigh, wisely says, 'The appreciation of a great author asks knowledge and industry before it is attempted, but, in the end, it is the critic and not the author who is judged by it and, where his sympathies have been too narrow or his sight too dim, condemned without reprieve and buried without a tombstone.' These words are especially true of Biblical writers, in view of the lack of data on which to arrive at an understanding of them.

Yet love unlocks doors that remain fast closed to any form of assault. And it is alone to love-inspired industry and knowledge that these difficulties will yield. The genuine critical spirit is neither bandit nor cracksman to pluck out the heart of these old writers' mystery, but rather is of the quality of discipleship, which in return for reverent study may obtain the reward of patient merit—an entry into the master-mind. If such sympathy is called for in what, for want of a better word, we may call secular literature, how much clearer is the call for it in what, having regard to its final significance for man's good, we call the sacred literature of Holy Writ?

Nowhere else in all the world is it so dangerously easy for a critic to incur Milton's condemnation of him who was

deep-versed in books and shallow in himself

as in the historical criticism of the Bible, and nowhere else is it more vital that our sympathies be not too narrow or our sight too dim, than in our study of the varied contributions of its individual writers.

6. There is a third mode in which our sympathy demands exercise, if the truths of criticism are to go to the deepening of men's religious experience. Since it is our business in this connexion, 'by manifestation of the truth to commend ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God,' it is well for us that our sympathy should be

directed definitely towards those who are looking to us for guidance.

Historical criticism of Scripture, in relation to them, can never be an end in itself. Whether we like it or not, it must bear some relation, helpful or harmful, to their religious experience. It is thus imperative for us to bear constantly in mind that to the devout, and even to many not yet devout, Christ means much, and that criticism for them is valid only in so far as it makes Christ mean more. In a word, our sympathy with them should enable us to distinguish between criticism as a redemptive adjunct to religious experience and criticism as a hindrance to that experience. The responsibility thus placed upon the Christian ministry is not light, especially in the present critical situation in the religious world, yet 'if we but screw our courage to the sticking-point, we shall not fail.'

We at least know the danger. Narrowness of sympathy towards those who seek our help may take one of two directions. We may strive to ignore this criticism in public and content ourselves with mere homiletic musings in our teaching ministry. The peril of this course is very grave in its effects upon our people. It is certain that, however untrained they are in critical learning, these people are neither brainless nor unintelligent. They know that such criticism exists. They come to us, with a perfectly amazing trust in our integrity, expecting to receive counsel concerning it in relation to their own religious lives. If they do not obtain that counsel, concerning the need of which they are perfectly conscious, they may fall into a state of spiritual discouragement which may lead to the shipwreck of their faith. And the responsibility for this perfectly needless disaster will be ours.

For this reason alone, not to speak of the paralysing effect which such a course would produce alike on our own lives and ministry, it must be said that the merely 'preaching' commentary on Scripture is not now enough and will never again be enough.

As against this we may, by narrowness of sympathy, fall into the opposite error of a too crude presentation of the truth. It is possible to have such a thing as a blatant scholarship. It is possible to overawe an inquiring mind without helping it. It is intensely possible to affront people's intelligence by mere erudition; and not only to affront their intelligence but to insult their sense of taste, violate their sense of reverence, brand ourselves as ignorant of that greatest of all lore—the lore of the heart, and withal send them empty away. For

these reasons, the merely 'critical' commentary will always err by excess. In relation to average Christian experience, it will always be too much.

Difficult as this adjustment is, it is not impossible. If we have approached the general redemptive aim of the Scripture with a wise Christian sympathy, if we have tried to read the individual contributions with the mind of Christ, we can hardly fail to view those who are calling to us, with something of that divine compassion which He everywhere manifested to the inquiring mind. And such a spirit of compassion will secure alike the high content and quality of our teaching material and its correlation to the experience of men, in such a way that we shall be blessed of God, and they confirmed in Christ.

Yet even when we have determined the content of the help we have to give, we are confronted with one more demand upon our sympathy for them. We may all subscribe to the dictum *Magna est veritas et praevalebit*, but it is surely not necessary

to arm truth with a bludgeon. Granted that we have to utter truth, we are nevertheless bound to do so with due regard to the susceptibilities of those for whose sake we speak at all. The writer once attended a series of lectures by an eminent psychologist. Of all that he said, one thing stands out especially clearly—a peculiarly puerile yet nauseating illustration of a Freudian thesis. Afterwards, in speaking of this to a fellow-student, the writer was met by the statement, 'But it is the truth.' This is not an uncommon justification for a lack of sympathy. Yet it is surely a poor presentation of truth, which can be justified only by the abolition of life's reticences.

And so it is with historical criticism in relation to religious experience. The mere presentation of the truths of the former may fail for lack of sympathy with the latter. In this great problem of ours, shall it be said of us again that 'the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light'?

Recent Foreign Theology.

Pastoral Theology in Germany.

VERY wisely Herr Baumgarten¹ declines to define 'pastoral theology,' but he is convinced of its validity as a subject for scientific treatment, just as he is impressed by the difficulty of pastoral work in the present generation, particularly within the Protestant churches, where people no longer regard themselves even metaphorically as 'sheep.' In his opening discussion of the Biblical data, by the way, he does not allude to the significant fact that the metaphor of 'shepherding' in the sense of leadership and teaching of souls is practically a creation of Christianity. It is no longer the king who, as in Oriental life, is the 'shepherd' of his people; it is the minister of the Church. And, as we read in the last chapter of the Fourth Gospel, the commission of the Lord is to 'feed My sheep.' The Christian people belong to God, not to the pastor. He must be responsible for them, as Herr Baumgarten urges, but he has no right to lord it over them, or to treat a congregation as if it were

his private property, or as a sphere where he can exercise his gifts and display his abilities. One gathers from the pages of this handbook that the word 'pastor' has not been soiled in Germany, as it has been in Britain. The Nonconformist caricature of it, which Dickens popularized in creatures like Mr. Stiggins, has made 'pastor' in England an impossible term for self-respecting Christians to use, although oddly enough the adjective does not appear to have been degraded. We can still speak naturally and without offence of 'pastoral theology,' which is what Herr Baumgarten means by 'Seelsorge,' or the cure of souls, 'cure' denoting 'care.'

This is a survey marked by good sense and judgment. It is neither pietistic nor ecclesiastical. The personal qualifications of the minister, the function of the congregation, the various functions of a care of souls, and the resources available, are discussed. The author recognizes that in Protestantism the minister cannot be a *directeur de conscience* like the Roman priest. One might add that his function is also larger than that of the priest in the Greek Church. But Herr Baum-

¹ *Protestantische Seelsorge*, by O. Baumgarten (Mohr, Tübingen, 1931).

garten admits that the Reformed Churches need to develop some equivalent, in their own ethos, for the confessional.

The general principles as laid down here are familiar to English readers. Even some of the special pieces of advice, as, for example, on the danger of ministers making a wrong choice in marrying, are as common to one country as to another. I notice that the author feels obliged to introduce a section upon healing and psycho-analysis (pp. 273 f.). The three departments in which he finds pastoral work, conceived broadly, to operate are in relation to (a) doubt and scepticism, (b) suffering, and (c) sin. On the first he implores ministers not to be dictatorial or censorious. 'We official representatives of religion can only in the rarest cases cure the scepticism of politicians, learned men, or artists.' But we can at least avoid giving offence by our self-importance, eschewing official jargon, and being courteous and disinterested. The duty of those who are gifted is to master the subtle, varied reasons for such scepticism and to meet individual cases with tact and knowledge, knowledge which is not got up for the occasion but mastered and made our own.

Herr Baumgarten writes evidently out of a long experience, with knowledge of the zeal that is not according to knowledge in the clerical profession. Even a foreigner who does not know the inside of the churches for whom he is writing, cannot help feeling that this is a wise counsellor, who is alive to the new needs which are in essence so old, though new in some of their developments.

F. W. Robertson still seems to be the chief English preacher known to Germany, if one may judge from the pages of this handbook. But among the few devotional books in English noticed by the author are the *Pilgrim's Progress* and the *Saints' Everlasting Rest*, and Peabody's morning and evening chapel addresses ('die ein reiches Gegenwartleben in ein plastisch gedeutetes biblisches Bild zusammendrängen,' a well-deserving commendation). His last word is surprising, Let the minister read Church newspapers, like the *Christliche Welt*! That is, when religious newspapers do not go in too much for ecclesiastical politics.

Harnack's 'Dogmengeschichte.'

WE have already noted the appearance of the first volume of the 'Dogmengeschichte' in its fifth edition (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xlii. 566).

The second volume¹ covers the first book, *i.e.* the development of the Church's dogma as the doctrine of the God-man, upon the basis of natural theology, with the triple appendix upon Manichæism, the Paulicians, and Islam. Even since 1909, when a few additions were made to the text, the progress of scholarship in most of the spheres covered by this volume has necessitated a correction of some views held by the distinguished author. On Macarius the Egyptian monk, for example, the researches of Dr. Crafer would require to be valued by a modern student; the cursory remarks on p. 449 are now antiquated. Similarly, the estimate of Dionysius the Areopagite (pp. 450 f.) needs to be reset in the light of recent investigation by Rolt and others; the hypothesis of Stiglmayr, that the real author of these tracts was Severus of Antioch, seems hardly credible, but the inner mysticism has been re-studied from a less speculative point of view than Harnack represents. Even Dr. H. F. Mueller's attempt, in his *Dionysius, Proklos, Plotinos* (1926), to bring out the influence of Plotinus rather than of Proclus upon the Dionysian scheme does not take into sufficient account the broader gnostic and early Christian influences. On the cult of Mary (pp. 476 f.) there must be added Koch's *Adhuc Virgo* (1929), and the different estimate of J. M. Bover's *Maria Mediatrix* (1929). But, details apart, it is remarkable how this classical work of Harnack stands; as a survey it is not likely to be superseded soon.

JAMES MOFFATT.

New York.

Maurice Goguel's Life of Jesus.

MR. MAURICE GOGUEL has written his life of Jesus. It is a work planned upon ample lines, dealing, in a scholarly and lucid fashion, with a hundred and one problems circling round and about the central theme. Indeed, the architecture of the book is odd. Here is *La Vie de Jésus* (Payot, Paris; 60 fr.), a book of less than six hundred pages. More than one-third of it is really prolegomena—interesting and important—but still prolegomena. Can there be a life of Christ at all? Is Jesus a Myth or an Historical Character? What are the Sources, canonical and otherwise? And what is their value to an historian? Some vivid pages upon Paul, and the little life of Christ that can, as Renan said,

¹ *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, Fünfte photo-mechanische gedruckte Auflage, ii. (Mohr, Tübingen: Subscription price, M.24).

be constructed from his Epistles. The plan of Mark, much more subtle and artistic than Papias thought—and so on and so on. While, apart from some consideration of the ideas in our Lord's mind at the start of His Galilean ministry and occasional references elsewhere, His whole teaching is dismissed in thirty-five pages!

Doubtless Goguel argues that, like the Early Church, he is more interested in what Jesus was and did than in what He said, that His preaching is a footnote to His character and life. Still the thing is symptomatic. To have twenty-eight pages on the form and style of the Lord's teaching—on such matters as the difference between a parable and an allegory, and only six on the moral teaching itself, is lopsided. And that is characteristic. The book is able, but external, academic, cold. Emil Ludwig maintains that 'if you want to make a subject live, you must live with him, think with him, eat with him. Unless you have a certain mad, furious, passionate relationship to your subject you can never make him live to other minds.' Nothing could be less like the cool and detached attitude with which Jesus is here regarded. Goguel knows the environs of the Temple with meticulous thoroughness. But he never penetrates into the Holy Place. The wonder of Jesus does not move, nor awe, nor overwhelm him. His eyes never kindle; his pulse beats on quite evenly, even upon Calvary where he can pace to and fro calmly measuring things. He tells us all about Jesus, but Jesus Himself seems almost to elude him.

Still, within its limits, it is a notable book. These limits, as the sincere and moving preface tells us, are deliberately chosen. And we are promised a second volume in which is to be shown how 'the faith and attachment which Jesus awoke in the heart of His disciples, after suffering an eclipse at the moment of His Passion, reappeared in them in the form of the affirmation of the Resurrection of their Master, and how on the basis of this faith the Christian Church has been founded and its doctrine elaborated.' So far so good. But even that cannot fill in the immense lacunæ in this initial volume, which indeed is built up on the plan of furnishing an indispensable minimum which may easily be enriched and enlarged, but cannot be challenged. What, then, have we? Jesus, beginning as a disciple of the Baptist, broke with him on the ground that the latter taught that repentance and a new life really merited God's favour, whereas to Jesus it was all of grace and could never be earned. The Baptist never forgave one whom he held to be a renegade. In the spring of 27 Jesus begins His

own ministry in Galilee, which proceeds until September, at first circling round Capernaum, and then of a peripatetic nature. Warned of Herod's anger and deserted by the mass, He quits Galilee and goes to Jerusalem. There He remains until December, and then withdraws into a place in touch with His disciples in the capital, to which He returns for the Passover of 28, and meets His end. It will be noted that the Jerusalem ministry is made by this reckoning much longer than is usually thought; and the argument supporting the view is a detailed and interesting one. Goguel is a believer in the psychological method in history. At times he seems to use it somewhat rashly and to press it far. The few pages on the gospel, as he calls the chapter upon Jesus' Teaching, make one wish there had been many more. Provocative and suggestive, summing up much in a sentence, opening vistas upon either hand, they make one look forward to the promised second volume with high expectation.

A. J. GOSSIP.

Glasgow.

Kingdom of God.

DIFFICULT to read but full of interest and significance is Martin Buber's *Kingdom of God*,¹ whose thesis is that Israel began her historical career as a theocracy, and that this she was meant to be for all time. Jahweh was to be the King of Israel—He Himself and He alone: that is, theocracy was to be taken seriously. The discussion starts from the famous utterance of Gideon in Jg 8^{22f.}, where the most emphatic and unambiguous expression is given to this dogma, though for satisfactory contextual reasons, as explained by Buber, the root there, which occurs three times, is not מלך but מושל. He regards the Book of Judges not as a series of loosely connected tales on which a pragmatic scheme has been superimposed, but rather as consisting of two books, chs. 1-12 and 17-21 (with the Samson narrative intervening), of which the former is anti-monarchical in spirit and the latter monarchical. Gideon is the hero of the anti-monarchical principle, which receives powerful pictorial expression in Jotham's parable; Abimelech, on the other hand, is the foe of the theocratic principle. Chs. 17-21 are, as it were, a reply to chs. 1-12: they say, in effect, theocracy has been

¹ *Königtum Gottes*, von Martin Buber (Schocken Verlag, Berlin, S.W.19. Pp. 260; geh. RM.7.50; geb. RM.9.50).

tried and failed; theocracy means anarchy, monarchy means order.

The relevant passages of the Books of Exodus and Joshua are then interpreted in the light of this theocratic principle, which is contrasted with cognate ideas among other Semitic peoples. There are valuable discussions of the covenant idea, of יהוה, and יהוה צבאות, all of which go to confirm Buber's theocratic thesis. The book is the first of three whose general theme is the origin of the Messianic faith and whose ultimate interest is eschatological. The Messianic faith of Israel, in its central content, is defined as being directed to the fulfilment of the relation between God and the world in the perfect sovereignty of God as King.

JOHN E. MCFADYEN.

Trinity College, Glasgow.

Reason and Revelation.

THIS account of the relation between reason and revelation¹ seems to have come into being to give foundation to a sincere and earnest criticism of the theology of crisis. In the first, historical section, the Barthians loom very large. In them we might have expected to find a proper appreciation of the disparateness and mutual exclusiveness of the two entities, for Barth and Brunner at least profess to set out from the *fons et origo* of the Word of God,

¹ *Vernunft und Offenbarung*, von Dr. Robert Jelke (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh. RM.4).

from the self-revelation of God. Here then, surely, is a really theocentric theology.

But Professor Jelke has cunningly shown that whatever may be true of the dialectical method, the content of their thinking is anything but theocentric, for the message of revelation is in every case unfolded according to the requirements of a very particular view of human existence, a view which is not due to revelation, but to human reason. Thus Barth's view that 'the knowledge of God is knowledge in contradiction' is from man, rather than from God. And in Bultmann the principle is laid down, that 'the theological explanation of the life of faith must be grounded on the philosophical analysis of existence.' Only so does it acquire the character of science, and cease to be merely sermonizing. In both, therefore, and in all their colleagues, the problem is posited, or at least formulated, by reason, and, as usual, the formulation predetermines the solution arrived at. Thus the 'Theology of the Word of God' is to a much larger degree than its devotees have been aware, a theology of the thought of man.

There follows a systematic section, where it is shown that the gulf between reason and revelation cannot be bridged, no matter from which end of it we set out. Thus, finally, we reach the justification of the standpoint of Martin Luther, lost afterwards when Melancthon and the later reformers desired to have logic on their side. Reason is the thought of man, revelation is the Word of God.

JOHN MONTEITH.

Bridge of Weir.

Entre Nous.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, 1932-1933.

WE summarize below some of the features for 1932-33.

In addition to single expository articles—the one this month is by the Venerable Archdeacon A. E. J. Rawlinson, D.D.—there will be a series on 'The Message of the Epistles.' Professor C. H. Dodd, D.D., and the Reverend James Reid, M.A., will contribute early studies. A missionary series will discuss the Apologetic of Missions; Swaraj in the Mission Field; Missionary Method, with special

reference to Mass Movements; the Future of Educational Missions, with special reference to the Lindsay Report; Are Missions a Temporary Phenomenon?; 'Ad Interim' Ethics and the Results of Missions.

There will be articles on Early Church History, centring round prominent figures. Professor Moffatt will continue 'Letters to Women on the Christian Faith.' 'Present-Day Movements' will be continued. This month a first-hand and authoritative account of 'The Kingdom of God Movement in Japan' is given by Dr. William Axling, who has

spent thirty-one years in Japan and served as one of the executive secretaries of the movement.

'Why I am a Protestant' will be the basis of a discussion.

Some articles on 'Present-Day Ethical Problems' will find a place.

These special series are in addition to the usual features—Notes of Recent Exposition, Literature, In the Study, Entre Nous, Recent Foreign Theology, Contributions and Comments, and single articles on a wide variety of subjects, critical and otherwise.

'A Man's Life.'

Under this title, Mr. Jack Lawson, Labour Member for Chester-le-Street, has written a notable story—sincere and vivid—the account of one 'average' mining working-class family. We must query the 'average.' It is not a set autobiography—his own story is told, he says, because he was a member of that family, and there is little mention of the years after 1919, when he was first returned to Parliament.

The book (published by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net), one feels, gives an absolutely faithful picture of life as it was lived by that family of father and mother and five brothers and five sisters, first at Kells, then at Flimby, and lastly in Durham; and it is so excellently written that it may be read in an evening, at a sitting. It opens with a description of the sailor-miner-father, imaginative and gentle-tempered, and the mother—a 'great mother' she seems to him, and to the reader too before the book is finished. 'She was a tigress who punished at times almost to the point of cruelty, but if she struck her cubs with her claws now and then, she stood on duty at the lair with bared teeth and snarling lips ready to fight to the death for her own. She faced the world in her primitive way. . . . She had her rigid code of conduct, which she enforced on herself and others: fight your battles and no whining, tell the truth, pay your debts, and so conduct yourself that you need never be ashamed. . . . I am proud of that mother who said to me in her old age: "I punished you, I was rough, I was ignorant, but I brought you all through safely, and I never did a thing of which any of you might be ashamed."'

In spite of the herculean toil of father and mother, Sunday was the only day on which there was a good dinner. At twelve he went to the pit, but all his spare time was spent in reading. It gave his father great concern: 'My concentration alarmed

him, and he often warned me of the probable results of too much reading. He was really concerned for my mental condition.' At the coal-face he and Jack Woodward talked George Borrow and Ruskin. And it was Woodward who said to him, 'You know, you should go to Oxford.' 'Me go to Oxford, a place which was in the land of Never Never.' The account of how the eighteen months at Ruskin College became possible makes good reading; and at the end of the two years he was back at the pit again.

'In my pit days there was work for all miners. . . . We never lacked a day's work, or the pride and pleasure of putting our pay into the hand of wife or mother. And if you think there was no pride you know nothing about it. Then, the day's or week's work over, to put aside the pit things and relax to a little pleasure—sport, a book, the garden, or music. A man's work done, beholden to no one, genial to all. Hard, driving, dangerous work, giving little returns—but yet work, so that a man felt he had a place in the world. But now! Good men, bad men, indifferent men, it is all one, idle, drifting to moral death. Great is Progress, and mightily to be praised. But nowhere is there any hope; nowhere, I say. If there is, then I who hope when most men doubt, being so constituted, cannot see that hope. Desire, yes, but the will is wanting, for often we desire things for which we will not pay the price. There is no lack of charity, for the one consolation in this time is that kindliness lies over the land like the gladdening, glistening morning dew on roses in June. But kindliness will not do it, unless it marks the growth of the social sense that instinctively warns us of the danger, so that we are shocked into forcing our will to find a way out of it.'¹

Mr. Lawson was, and continues to be, a member of the 'Society'—this, of course, means the Methodist Society. Here is his testimony as to what it has meant for him: 'Have not a host of the clever literary and philosophic writers exposed the "little Bethel" for what it was? True; and there were tendencies to narrowness and hypocrisy which sometimes needed rough handling. So do all institutions need it at times. But that does not make it any the less a fact that the most powerful force for the mental and moral elevation of the workers during the industrial era has been this contemptuously called "Little Bethel." . . . Fortunately there are historians and philosophers who know, and are not afraid to show, that if Britain holds a comparatively advanced position

¹ J. Lawson, *A Man's Life*, 275.

in her social movements to-day it is largely because the eighteenth-century Methodist Revival saturated the industrial masses with a passion for a better life, personal, moral, mental, and social.¹

Kindness.

Not the least part of that divinity which shaped my ends was the exceeding fineness and kindliness of a host of men and women whom I met on the road from childhood to manhood. There are those who are ever saying, 'Human nature being what it is,' as though human nature was very sordid and suspect. It is true there are sordid, selfish, mean people in the world, but human nature generally has been, in my experience, compellingly kind, and oft-times noble. And I owe more to the great heritage which such men and women have left and to those whom I met than I will ever be able to repay.²

Gambling.

I'm glad literature ended my gambling propensities, for it is a fever that burns one up, an irritating thing, that makes you want to win; dissatisfied when you do win, almost happy when you lose again; and will not let you be really quiet at any time. A misery-making thing is gambling, promising everything and giving nothing. But I learned much of men and their ways—and I was old before I was young in that respect.³

The Primitive Methodist and the Duke.

The first General Assembly or Conference of a United Methodist Church representing the great Wesleyan Methodist community, the Methodist Free Churches, and the Primitive Methodist Church, has just been held in London. It is not surprising under circumstances so remarkable and epoch-making that the last-named denomination has issued an historical record, fully illustrated, under the title *A Methodist Pageant*, compiled by Mr. B. Aquila Barber, the Connexional Editor (Holborn Publishing House; 5s. net). This is intended as 'a token of remembrance of the consecrated men and women of the Primitive Methodist Church who have sustained a distinctive ministry over a period of one hundred and twenty years.' There can be no doubt about the future influence of the men and women of this branch of the United

Methodist Church, with their noble traditions, upon its world-wide ministrations.

In the early years of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in England, as in the far later years of the Free Church of Scotland, sites for new chapels or churches were difficult to get from the local land-owner. Here is what happened in the case of a zealous Primitive Methodist in search of a site and the Duke of Cleveland of the day:

'Some four or five miles from Middleton-on-Teesdale, on the high road to Alston, is the village of Bowlees, in which we have a neat and attractive chapel. The tale which is told about the securing of the site on which that building stands will illustrate the romance of our earlier history in this respect. For a long time fruitless efforts had been made to obtain a suitable plot of land. The agent of the great proprietor of the district—the Duke of Cleveland—had been often memorialized, but without success. But there was one man, at any rate, in the little society, whose faith was not to be daunted by any difficulty. "Willie" Wilkinson, a sturdy dalesman, racy of the soil, after a course of earnest prayer, resolved to present his plea personally to the great landlord. The Duke and a distinguished shooting-party were staying just then at the High Force Inn, a short distance farther up the dale; and Willie, accompanied, it is said, by the "travelling preacher," made his way thither. On asking permission to see his Grace, he was of course refused, but brushing past the man in buttons, Willie, closely followed by his companion, halted not until he reached the ducal presence. Without hesitation he walked up to his Grace and, grasping him by the hand, exclaimed: "How aire ye, Mister Deuk, an' hoo's Missis Deuk?"

'The Duke instantly saw that he had a "character" before him, and adapting himself with great adroitness to the situation, asked Willie what he wished.

'"Ah want a bit o' grund, Mister Deuk, to beeld a Primitive Methodist cheppel on. An' Mister Deuk, it's nut the furst teyme we've axed for't nowther. A've seygned pepper after pepper mysel'; an' we've nivver heerd nowt aboot it at aw."

'The Duke turned to his agent, who was present, and asked if this was so. The agent confessed that Willie's statement was true, but said he had never considered the matter of sufficient importance to present to his Grace.

'"Ah always thowt," burst out Willie, "that was t' way on't. Ah've nivver spoken to ye in my

¹ J. Lawson, *A Man's Life*, 109.

² *Ibid.*, 182.

³ *Ibid.*, 80.

life, but ah was sure ye were a decent sootart o' man. Ah always thowt it was them nasty bodies about ye. An', Mister Deuk, if we get som o't poachers about here convarted i' the cheppel we want to beeld, ye'll mebbe be obleeged to us."

"You shall have a piece of land, most certainly, my good man," said his Grace.

"Thank ye, Mister Deuk." ¹

MYSTICAL POETRY.

Dean Inge has written a fifteen-page introduction to *Lyra Mystica*, an excellent anthology of mystical verse arranged chronologically, which has just been published by Messrs. Macmillan & Co. (7s. 6d. net). The Editor is Dr. Charles Carroll Albertson, an American minister.

'What is Mysticism?' Dean Inge first asks; and after a number of definitions he finds that 'There are several paths up the hill of the Lord. They meet at the top, in the beatific vision, but the tracks start from different sides. . . . Some of the poems in this volume express the symbolism of the nature-mystics; others the raptures of contemplative devotion.'

He next surveys the history of mysticism. In writing the introduction he puts his imprimatur on the anthology. It is significant that the last English poet whom he mentions is Tennyson, and the only poet noticed after Lowell on the other side is Sidney Lanier.

On page 71 is quoted Herbert's beautiful 'Love Bade Me Welcome,' so often heard in Communion addresses in the Scottish Church:

Love bade me welcome; yet my soul drew back,
Guilty of dust and sin.
But quick-eyed Love, observing me grow slack
From my first entrance in,
Drew nearer to me, sweetly questioning
If I lacked anything.
'A Guest,' I answered, 'worthy to be here.'
Love said: 'You shall be he.'
'I, the unkind, ungrateful? Ah, my dear,
I cannot look on Thee.'
Love took my hand, and smiling did reply,
'Who made the eyes, but I?'
'Truth, Lord, but I have marred them; let my
shame
Go where it doth deserve.'

¹ B. A. Barber, *A Methodist Pageant*, 96.

'And know you not,' saith Love, 'who bore the blame?'

'My dear, then I will serve.'

'You must sit down,' says Love, 'and taste My meat.'

So I did sit and eat.

On page 75 is the German seventeenth-century poem of Johann Scheffler, the first verse of which we must quote again:

Though Christ a thousand times

In Bethlehem be born,

If He's not born in thee

Thy soul is still forlorn.

The cross on Golgotha

Will never save thy soul,

The cross in thine own heart

Alone can make thee whole.

And now we turn to an English contemporary. The first two poems have the authentic note—has this?

HE IS THE LONELY GREATNESS OF THE WORLD.

He is the lonely Greatness of the World—

(His eyes are dim),

His power it is holds up the Cross

That holds up Him.

He takes the sorrow of the threefold hour—

(His eyelids close),

Round Him and round, the wind—His Spirit—
where

It listeth blows.

And so the wounded Greatness of the World

In silence lies—

And death is shattered by the light from out

Those darkened eyes.

MADELEINE CARON ROCK.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works,
and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street,
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.